A system of Christian doctrine /
230.6 C762s 10807
Conner, Walter Thomas,
Life Pacific College Alumni Library

A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

W. T. CONNER

DATE DUE

DEC 1 2 1988			

230.6
C762s

Conner, Walter Thomas
A system of Christian doctrine

A system of Christian doctrine /
230.6 C762s 10807

Conner, Walter Thomas,
LIFE Alumni Library

DEMCO

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-BMD-375

A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

W. T. CONNER, A.M., Th.D., D.D.

A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

By W. T. CONNER, A.M., Th.D., D.D.
Professor of Systematic Theology in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE
SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD
OF THE
SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

Copyright 1924
Sunday School Board
Southern Baptist Convention
Nashville, Tennessee

Printed in the United States of America

0.C
762s

L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

To the memory
of

DR. CALVIN GOODSPEED

and

DR. A. H. STRONG

both of whom have now passed
to the other side,
and to

DR. E. Y. MULLINS

world leader in present Christian thought
and activity—
to these, my three former teachers in theology, this book is dedicated
in grateful remembrance of what their instruction
has meant to me in the enrichment of
mental and spiritual life.

025971

PREFACE

This book is the outgrowth of thirteen years' experience in teaching theology in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. It is prepared mainly, but not exclusively, for the use of students. The analysis at the first of each chapter was inserted with the student in mind, although others will no doubt find it helpful in following the line of thought.

Where quotations of Scripture are given, they are taken mainly from the American revision. Quite frequently, however, I have sought to convey the substance of a Scripture passage rather than the exact quotation.

No originality is claimed with reference to the views set forth in this volume. So far as possible I have tried to state in my own way Christian truth as I understand it. I am indebted to many authors whose names are not mentioned in this volume. My indebtedness is sometimes as great or greater to the author with whom I did not agree as to the one whose views I accepted. One of the chief means of quickening thought that I have found is in the free discussion of the great questions of theology with students in the class room. I find that not all the wisdom and spiritual insight on these questions is wrapped up in the "dry and withered breasts" of theological professors.

I am indebted to several of my colleagues in the Seminary faculty for valuable suggestions in the preparation of the volume—including Profs. B. A. Copass and H. E. Dana, heads of the Old and New Testament departments, respectively. I am especially indebted to Prof. Albert Venting, my associate in the department of the-

ology, for help in the preparation and revision of the manuscript, in the preparation of the analysis at the beginning of each chapter, for the making of the indices and for constant and sympathetic suggestions concerning the thoughts presented and the arrangement of the material.

The book is sent forth in the hope, and with the prayer, that it may help to exalt him who has been made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption; and that it may help to bring in his reign in the hearts and lives of men.

W. T. Conner.

CONTENTS

Pages

The Task and Scope of Christian Doctrine..... 11-24

PART ONE

The Question of Knowledge in Religion: The Christian Doctrine of Revelation..... 25-126

CHAPTER I

The Problem: Can Man Know God?..... 27-33

CHAPTER II

Our Knowledge of God in Christ..... 34-70

CHAPTER III

Subordinate Revelations of God..... 71-90

CHAPTER IV

Theories that Deny the Christian Revelation.... 91-104

CHAPTER V

The Christian Revelation and the Bible.....105-126

PART TWO

The Christian Doctrine of Christ and of God....127-267

CHAPTER I

The Person of Christ.....129-179

CHAPTER II

The Christian Conception of God.....180-228

CONTENTS—*Continued*

PAGES

CHAPTER III

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.....228-260

CHAPTER IV

The Doctrine of the Trinity.....260-267

PART THREE

The Christian Doctrine of the World and Man..267-350

CHAPTER I

God and the World.....269-292

CHAPTER II

The Origin and Nature of Man.....293-308

CHAPTER III

The Christian Doctrine of Sin 309-350

PART FOUR

The Christian Doctrine of Salvation.....351-562

CHAPTER I

God's Purpose of Redemption.....353-372

CHAPTER II

The Atoning Work of Christ.....373-411

CHAPTER III

Becoming a Christian or the Beginning of Salvation 412-472

CHAPTER IV

The Nature of the Christian Life.....473-508

CHAPTER V

The Consummation of Salvation or the Coming of the Kingdom of God.....509-562

Indices 563

INTRODUCTION

THE TASK AND SCOPE OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

Preliminary Definition

I. The material of Christian Doctrine.
   1. The material: the Christian religion.
   2. Definition of Christianity.
      (1) A religion.
      (2) Centers in Jesus Christ.
      (3) A religion of redemption.
      (4) Realized through faith.
      (5) An experience of fellowship with God.

II. The purpose of Christian Doctrine.
   1. To set forth the doctrinal content of Christianity.
   2. To set forth this doctrinal content as a Christian sees it.

III. Christian Doctrine distinguished from related studies.
   1. Apologetics.
   2. The Philosophy of Religion.
   3. Christian Ethics.
   4. Biblical Exegesis and Biblical Theology.
   5. History of Christianity and History of Doctrine.
   6. Comparative Religion.
   7. The Psychology of Religion.

IV. The need for Christian Doctrine.
   1. The need denied.
   2. Causes for this denial.
   3. Why doctrine is necessary.
   4. The limitations of theology.

V. Christian Doctrine a science. Two conditions; knowledge and system.

VI. Christian Doctrine progressive.
   1. Progressive in our understanding of Christ, but never beyond him.
   2. Need, therefore, for restating theology.

Christian doctrine or theology has been defined as the interpretation of the Christian religion.[1] Taking this as our starting point, rather than as a complete and final definition, let us notice two or three things about it.

I. **The material of Christian Doctrine.** 1. The material is Christianity. In the first place, it tells us what the material of our study is to be. It is the Christian religion. In beginning any line of investigation, the first thing we must know is: What is the object that we are to study? Our investigation would be aimless wandering, unless we could definitely set out before ourselves the object that we are to study. Our field of investigation must first be marked off.

2. Definition of Christianity. The object that we are to study is Christianity. So perhaps the first thing we should do would be to answer to ourselves the question: What is Christianity? Of course an exhaustive answer to that question is impossible, and fortunately is not needed. But a brief answer to the question will help us to determine not only the range or material of our study, but also something of its nature and method. Let it be also understood that the answer to the question: What is Christianity? is somewhat arbitrarily set out. So far as a vindication of the answer here proposed is given it must be found in the body of the treatise which follows. The answer will serve the purpose of showing the point of view from which Christianity is to be regarded in the work that follows.

Note, then, the following points with reference to Christianity:

(1) It is a religion. No strict definition of religion is needed for our present purpose. It deals with the idea of God and the unseen world. It has to do with man's relation to the divine and the spiritual. Christianity is

[1]Mullins, "The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression."

one of the religions of the world. That is the most general aspect under which we can view it.

(2) It goes back in history to the appearance of Jesus Christ in human history. There was no Christianity before Jesus came into the world, and of course there were no Christians. Christianity grew out of the life, teaching and redemptive work of Jesus Christ. This marks Christianity as a religion that is historical in its character. It has had a definite historical origin in the world and a historical development. Both its origin and its development can be investigated as any other facts of history.

(3) It is a religion of redemption. The immediate and primary aim of Christianity is the salvation of man from sin. The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost.[1] The early Christians preached Jesus as the only name under heaven among men whereby they must be saved.[2] Paul proclaims the gospel as being the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.[3] From the days of the New Testament down to the present men have rejoiced in finding salvation from sin in Jesus Christ.

(4) This experience of salvation is by faith in Jesus Christ. Two things here are noticeable. One is that the proclamation of nothing but Jesus as Savior produces this experience of salvation in others. One may preach anything other than the gospel of Christ without producing this experience of salvation in the hearer. The other thing is that no other attitude toward Christ than that of faith in him as Savior and Lord brings this experience of salvation. Christianity, then, is a religion characterized by this attitude toward him. Any other attitude toward him is not the Christian attitude.

(5) This experience of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ is an experience of fellowship with God. In realizing the forgiveness of sins we come to know God.[4]

[1]Luke 19: 10. [2]Acts 4: 12. [3]Rom. 1: 16. [4]Heb. 8: 10-12.

This knowledge of God and the experience of salvation from sin through faith in Jesus are one and inseparable.

We might define Christianity, then, as the religion of conscious fellowship with God, in the experience of redemption from sin, through faith in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord. This religion is to be the object of our study.

II. **The purpose of Christian Doctrine.** We are to study, then, the Christian religion. What kind of a study of the Christian religion is proposed in a course in Christian doctrine?

The statement with which we started says that Christian doctrine is an interpretation of the Christian religion. This general statement needs more definite explanation. There are all sorts of interpretations or explanations of the Christian religion. Some of these explanations practically explain it away. There is nothing left when some people get through explaining it. The purpose, then, of a course in Christian doctrine needs closer definition.

1. The purpose of Christian doctrine is to set forth the doctrinal content of the Christian religion. It is often said that Christianity is not a doctrine or dogma, nor a philosophy, but a life. With this we readily agree. But it does not mean that Christianity does not involve a particular way of regarding God, man and the world in their relations with one another. Man's fellowship with God in Christ does imply certain views of God and man and their relations. It also excludes certain other views. To interpret the Christian religion by setting forth the views involved in this fellowship with God is the purpose of Christian doctrine. That is, Christian doctrine is the interpretation of Christianity from the point of view of its doctrinal content, not its history, its ethical principles or its missionary history and achievements.

2. Furthermore, Christian doctrine is such an interpretation of Christianity as a Christian would give. It is an inside interpretation, an interpretation that grows out of the insight that results from the experience of redemption. It is not an alien, unsympathetic interpretation. Christian teaching is the teaching by means of which a Christian interprets to himself and to others the facts of the Christian religion, particularly his experience of salvation by faith in Christ.

III. **Christian Doctrine distinguished from related studies.** We can get a still more definite idea of the purpose and scope of Christian doctrine by distinguishing it from certain other lines of theological investigation that are closely related to it. It is evident, from what has been said, that Christian doctrine belongs to the general field of theoretical theology. But there are certain other closely related studies. From these we will try to distinguish Christian doctrine.

1. Apologetics. The purpose of a treatise on Christian doctrine is not primarily to vindicate the Christian religion or prove it true. That is the task of apologetics or Christian evidences. The task of Christian doctrine is rather to set forth the doctrinal content of Christianity. Its purpose is to set forth what Christianity holds as true concerning God and man in their relations with each other. Its purpose is not to answer the question: Is Christianity true? but rather: What does Christianity hold for true? It does not so much undertake to vindicate the Christian view of God and man as to set forth what that view is.

This does not mean that Christianity is unconcerned as to the truth or falsity of its positions. But it does mean two things: first, that the task of a treatise on Christian doctrine is to set forth the doctrinal content of Christianity and let the Christian view of God and

man carry with it its own vindication by the appeal that it makes to man's moral and rational nature; and, secondly, that whatever effort is made to prove the Christian view true is secondary. The primary task is to find and set forth that view. The task of Christian evidences is a worthy one, but it is not the primary aim of a treatise on Christian doctrine.

Perhaps a more accurate way of putting the matter is to say that Christian evidences is such a statement of the case for Christianity as is intended to convince one who does not believe in the truth of Christianity or to confirm in his faith one who does believe; while Christian doctrine deals with the doctrines of Christianity in such a way as to instruct in Christianity those who accept the Christian point of view but desire a fuller knowledge of the meaning of the Christian religion.

2. The Philosophy of Religion. Nor is the primary aim of a course in Christian doctrine a rational justification or vindication of religion. Such a rational construction of religion is rather the task of the philosophy of religion. The purpose of the philosophy of religion is to vindicate the place of religion in human life. This it does by studying the origin, nature and function of religion. This again is a worthy task, but it is not the primary aim of Christian doctrine. A philosophy of Christianity aims to give a rational construction of Christianity and its place in human life. It intends to answer the question: Is the Christian view of life rationally defensible? while the task of Christian doctrine, as already stated, is to answer the question: What is the Christian view of life?

3. Christian Ethics. Again, a study of Christian doctrine is to be distinguished from Christian ethics. The task of Christian ethics is to set forth the meaning of Christianity for the moral life of man. It is to answer such questions as: What is the Christian moral ideal?

What dynamic does Christianity furnish for the attainment of that ideal? These questions come within the range of Christian doctrine but in a secondary way. In Christian doctrine we are dealing with Christianity first of all as a religion, while in Christian ethics we are looking at it first of all as an ethical ideal and power. Religion and ethics are inseparably bound up together, but they are not the same thing. Christianity is an ethical religion. That is one of its chief glories. But it is more than an ethical system or a moral force. It is a religion. It deals with man first of all as related to God and as a child of eternity. Its ethical power lies in the fact that it is a religion. It helps man in his ethical life because it first adjusts his relation to God. Ethics without the dynamic power of religion can not be a permanent ethical force.

Here we are to remember that it would be an easy matter to carry these distinctions too far. It is not meant that in studying Christian doctrine we are indifferent with reference to the truth or falsity of the positions taken, or with reference to the rational construction of Christianity or religion in general, or with reference to the ethical content of Christianity and its meaning for the moral life of man. These are all vital questions and Christian doctrine as a theological discipline is concerned with them all. But these are not the primary concern of a course in Christian doctrine. These questions concern us in considering Christian doctrine but in a somewhat secondary way. There are other branches of theological study in which these are the main questions. These are the main subjects of inquiry in Christian evidences, the philosophy of religion and ethics. Here our main concern is to set forth the fundamental doctrines involved in the Christian way of looking at life and the Christian way of governing our conduct.

4. Biblical Exegesis and Theology. A study of Christian doctrines is closely related to all lines of Biblical study. It is in the Bible that we have the record of the unfolding of God's redemptive purpose for the race. This purpose comes to its climax in Christ. It follows, then, that an understanding of the Bible is necessary to a correct understanding of Christian doctrine. A system of Christian doctrine must be based on a correct exegesis of the Bible.

A further word is necessary as to the relation of Biblical theology to Christian doctrine. Biblical theology in the technical sense is a comparatively recent science. It has for its purpose the orderly setting forth of the teachings of the Biblical writers on the fundamental topics of religion, in the order of their development in the Bible. It divides its material into the two great divisions of Old and New Testament theology and then subdivides these according to the teaching of certain great writers or groups of writers. The effort is not only to get the Biblical teachings unmixed with speculative or non-Biblical material, but also to see these teachings in their place in the unfolding of God's redemptive plan. A system of Christian doctrine differs from this in two respects. The first is that it undertakes to get the teaching of the Bible as a whole on any particular topic of theology and, therefore, to get its teaching as a unity and finality. The second is that it looks to other sources of light besides the Bible. It looks to any source of light that promises help in understanding any topic under consideration.

5. The History of Christianity and the History of Doctrines. It is interesting and helpful to study Christian doctrine in the light of Christian history, especially in view of the great evangelistic and missionary movements of history. It helps us to understand Christianity as a religion of redemption if we take into account its redemptive achievements.

But especially is it instructive to a student of Christian doctrine to study the history of doctrines. To trace the thought movements in Christian theology is within itself a fascinating task. Especially will this enable us to see how certain consequences follow upon the holding of certain doctrines, how certain methods and tendencies in doctrine react upon life. The great creeds in particular are of interest to one who studies Christian doctrine. This is true also of the great theologians. But neither the great theologians nor the great creeds can be accepted as final and authoritative. We must go back to the Bible itself and in the light of Christian history and our own experience of redemption interpret that for ourselves. Every generation of Christians must do this in view of its own special problems of thought.

6. Comparative Religion. Comparative religion is a study of the other religions of the world in comparison with Christianity. Closely related to this is the study of the history of the different religions. Under the guise of a scientific study of the religions of the world many foolish opinions have been advanced—opinions which have been arrived at by abstract speculation without foundation in fact. Many scholars in this realm have evolved their conclusions from their own inner consciousness—advancing as scientific conclusions what, as a matter of fact, amounted to their own subjective fancies or imaginings. Yet, in spite of this, the study throws much light upon man's religious nature and is helpful in understanding religion as a fact and factor in human life. Any study that helps us to understand man's religious nature and the nature of religion will also help us in our study of Christian doctrine.

7. The Psychology of Religion. The psychology of religion is the scientific study of the religious consciousness. It is closely related to comparative religion and the philosophy of religion. Especially if we include the study of Christian experience, which is the only religious

experience there is to study in which man has a definite consciousness of finding God, it furnishes us much valuable material for a study of Christian doctrine. Outside of the definitely Christian experience of salvation through faith in Jesus, it does not furnish us much material.

IV. **The need for Christian Doctrine.** 1. There is a decided tendency in religious circles to-day to deny the need for any definite religious doctrines. It has even been proposed that men should be ordained to the Christian ministry without reference to their doctrinal beliefs.

2. The causes for this antipathy to religious doctrines are not difficult to find. One is an overemphasis in the past on doctrine as compared to Christian character and benevolent activity. Closely related to this was the insistence placed on unimportant and traditional elements in Christian doctrine—a holding to the traditions of men in the place of the word of God. This was often accompanied by an acrimonious and unbrotherly spirit in the discussion of divisive issues among Christians. No doubt, too, theologians have sometimes assumed that they knew more than they really knew. A practical and somewhat agnostic age is reacting against an over-dogmatic and know-all spirit in theology and telling us that what it wants is religion, not theology. The theological age in the development of religion, we are told, is rapidly passing. Some people regard a system of theology about as they do the vermiform appendix—as an organ of the body brought over from a former stage of development, an organ that has outlived its function in the body and that is liable to get one into trouble at any time; the sooner, therefore, it is amputated the better. Another thing that contributes to this tendency is the desire to avoid conflict between religious doctrine and current scientific and philosophical views.

3. This reaction against doctrine is partly justifiable, but like all reactions against extremes this reaction is itself going to the extreme. A man who raises cattle might as well say that he cared nothing for bones, that all he wanted was flesh in his cattle, as for one to say that he wanted religion without theology. Truly he wants flesh, but a boneless cow would doubtless not be a very convenient animal to care for. A religion without doctrine would be about as formless and useless as a boneless cow.

A religion without doctrine is an impossibility for a rational being. Man's rational nature is the fundamental reason why he must have a theology. Religion without doctrine would be a religion without truth. A rational being could not receive such a religion. He could not interpret it to himself nor convey its meaning and blessings to others. Christianity regards God as a being of perfect intelligence who reveals himself to man as an intelligent being. To eliminate doctrine from Christianity, therefore, would be to eliminate the element of intelligence from it. Such a religion could be a religion only for people without minds. A religion without theology could be only a matter of practical activity or of pure feeling or a combination of these. But activity that was not directed by intelligence would not be "practical"; it would be activity directed to no good end. A religion of feeling that is not controlled and directed by intelligence becomes fanaticism or even degenerates into sensuality.

The gospel of Christ is a gospel of truth. The passion for truth is one of the things characteristic of the Christian spirit. A knowledge of the truth of the gospel is necessary to an intelligent adjustment of man's relationship to the God of truth.

4. In contending for the necessity of doctrine in religion, we are, of course, not denying that there are great limitations on theology. Man can not, because of his

limited intelligence, know all the truth about God and man and their relations. But to say this is not to say that his knowledge is not real knowledge so far as it goes. There are a good many other things that one may not know all about, yet may know something about; that is, one may have real knowledge without having perfect knowledge.

V. **Christian Doctrine a science.** If science is systematized knowledge, then we shall have to say that Christian doctrine is a science, provided we grant that in Christianity we have any definite and real knowledge of God. But if religion is only a blind groping after a God who does not exist or who has not revealed himself to man, if religion is only a superstition or an unintelligent non-moral mysticism, in that case, of course, Christian doctrine is not a science. If the central object in religion is non-existent or unknowable, teaching about such an object could not be a science. Science deals with reality, and if the object of our supposed knowledge in religion is not real, there is no possibility of a science of Christian teaching about such an object. Does the Christian in his religious experience know God? If so, we have the first condition necessary to a science, a knowledge of reality in the particular realm with which we are dealing. The answer to this question we must postpone.

But to have a science we must not only have knowledge, our knowledge must be systematized. In the realm of religion, knowledge can not be classified or systematized after the same manner that it can in the realm of mathematics or the physical sciences. Some would limit the term science to those branches of human learning in which knowledge can be stated in mathematical formulae or with the exactitude of mechanical laws. Certainly in that case theology would not be a science. But this is an arbitrary limitation of the term.

Under such a restriction of the term, not only would theology be ruled out as a science, but also history, sociology, psychology, ethics and all other lines of thought that deal with the nature and activities of free personalities.

VI. **Christian Doctrine progressive.** We will anticipate our future discussion enough to say that Christian theology is not progressive in the sense that the Christian revelation has never reached any point of finality. That revelation did come to a finality in Jesus Christ. He was not simply one step in an endless revelation. In him God spoke his final word concerning his will for man and man's relation to God. God's revelation came to a climax in Christ. He was the consummation of Old Testament revelation. The New Testament is the final revelation of God to men so far as the literary record is concerned.

But in the sense of a better understanding of Christ and a fuller appropriation of the life of God given in him, theology is progressive. Certainly this is true of the individual Christian. Why should it not be true of Christians in general? The modern study of the Bible, one-sided as it sometimes is, is nevertheless bringing men to a better understanding of the nature of God's revelation to men and his redemptive purpose concerning them. Every revival of spiritual religion and missionary activity should lead to a deeper knowledge of God. This we believe is being brought about in spite of many opposing forces and counter currents.

But let it be understood that religious progress is toward Christ, not away from him, nor beyond him.

Theology, then, needs restating from age to age. The thought forms of men change. New emphases arise in religion as well as in other realms of life. One example will perhaps suffice to make this clear. The emphasis to-day is largely different from that of the ages preced-

ing the modern missionary age. How much do we find in the creeds of Christendom on the duty of missions? Christianity was interpreted with but slight reference to its dominant passion. A missionary age would naturally want a new interpretation and statement of Christianity with the emphasis at a new place. An age that looked upon religion as being little more than a kind of fire insurance policy against hell for the next life would naturally put the emphasis at a different place in interpreting Christianity from an age that looks upon Christianity as being a living power that makes men right with God and consequently right with one another in all social relations, which sends men out under the dynamic of love to save human life from wreck and ruin here as well as hereafter, socially as well as individually.

PART ONE

The Question of Knowledge in Religion: The Christian Doctrine of Revelation

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: CAN MAN KNOW GOD?

I. Importance and scope of the question—Fundamental in philosophy as well as in religion.

II. Two methods of dealing with the question.

1. Speculative or *a priori* method.
2. Examining the facts of religious experience.

III. Two things necessary to man's knowledge of God.

1. A revelation of God to man.
2. The capacity in man to know God.
   (1) Man has capacity to know some things.
   (2) He craves object of worship.
   (3) Bible assumes man's capacity to know God.
   (4) Answer found in man's fellowship with God in Christ.

I. **The importance and scope of the question.** When we come to treat the question of Christian doctrine in any thorough-going way, one of the first questions we meet is the question as to whether or not man can have religious knowledge at all. On the answer to this question depends everything else. If this question can not be answered in the affirmative, then our task is a hopeless one. Not only does the success or failure of our undertaking in studying Christian doctrine depend upon our ability to answer this question in the affirmative; it is a question upon which the life of religion itself depends. Unless man can and does know God, religion is only a superstition and a sham.

Moreover, the question of knowledge is the fundamental question with which modern philosophy has dealt. It is not a problem peculiar to religious thought. For certain reasons, such as the tremendous importance of the issues involved in religion and the fact that religion deals with the spiritual realm, this problem may be felt to be more difficult and acute in the realm of religion than elsewhere, but it is not a problem that concerns religion alone. It concerns every aspect of human life. What and how can man know? From the day that Socrates said "Know thyself" down to the time of the modern pragmatist who asks with Pilate, "What is truth?" philosophy has striven to find an answer to this question. No answer that is entirely satisfactory to philosophy has been found.

II. **Two methods of dealing with the question.**

In general, there are two methods of dealing with this question. One is the speculative or *a priori* method in which we take the abstract question—can man know God and seek in *a priori* manner, that is, apart from the testimony of experience, to decide whether such a thing is possible?

In this way, it has often been decided that man could not know God on the ground that God was infinite and man is finite and the finite cannot apprehend the infinite, or on some other such ground. The other way of dealing with the question is the method of examining the facts of religious experience. If ever the question is answered, it must be by an appeal to experience, not by the method of abstract speculation. To many questions we may not be able to find a satisfactory answer by the method of *a priori* speculation, and yet experience may give an answer that is sufficient and certain for all practical purposes.

It is not a question, then, as to whether we can work out in a speculative and *a priori* way the problem as to

how man knows God. It is rather a question as to whether we have sufficient evidence to lead us to believe that man does actually know God. Men might actually know God and have satisfactory assurance that they know him even if we could not work out a satisfactory theory as to the processes of the mind by which they know him. We can know that a good many things take place without knowing how they take place. I know that the eating of food sustains the life of my body without knowing all about the how of the matter. Nor do I have to know all about the how of it before eating. A man who insists that men have no right to be religious until he works out a satisfactory theory as to how men know God shows as little judgment as would one who should insist that men should not eat until he understood all about how eating food sustains the life of the body. And one who insists that we can not have Christian doctrine because he has not solved the problem of how men know God is like one who should insist that there can be no science of dietetics because he did not understand all about how food was digested and assimilated. Really the processes of life do not seem to wait on man's halting understanding. How poor and scanty would life be if that were true.

Moreover, the other sciences do not wait for the philosopher to work out his theory of knowledge. The philosophers have never solved the problem as to how mind knows matter. That is just as great a mystery and just as great a problem as how man knows God. But the physicist and the chemist go on developing their sciences without waiting for the philosopher to solve the problem as to how mind knows matter. The chemist knows without doubt that two gases, known as hydrogen and oxygen, under certain conditions will unite in a definite proportion to form a liquid known as water whether the philosopher ever solves the speculative question as to how mind knows matter. The chemist has a perfect

right to assume that he knows matter. The results, as well as his immediate consciousness, justify the assumption. The religious man has just as good right to assume that God is knowable as the chemist has to assume that matter is knowable. We shall see later that his assumption works as well as does the assumption of the chemist.

III. **Two things necessary to man's knowledge of God.** There are two factors in all knowledge—the objective and the subjective. There must be the object known and the subject who knows. The act of knowledge is always an act in which the knower and the object are brought into a certain relation. In religion the object of knowledge is primarily God. For man to know God two things would seem to be necessary.

1. The first is a revelation of God to man. God must somehow disclose himself to man. The idea of religion would be meaningless without a revelation on God's part. Religion involves a relation of mutual fellowship between God and man. Man must worship God. But he can not worship a God who has not made himself known. Man can not by searching find out God, if God has concealed himself. Every religion in the world believes that somehow God (or the gods) has made himself known to man. However various may be the conception as to the method and means by which the divine being reveals himself, all religions agree as to the fact that he does reveal himself.

By a revelation of himself we mean that somehow God has put himself within the range of man's knowing powers. We are thinking rather of the objective factor in religion; i. e., that God has brought himself to such a state of being, in relation to man, that makes it possible for man to apprehend God. The Christian claim is that God has brought himself into such a relation to mankind in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.

2. The second thing necessary to a knowledge of God is that man have the capacity to apprehend or know God. On the basis of an agnostic, materialistic or pantheistic philosophy, it has often been denied that man has this capacity. Attention will be given to these denials later. Here, however, we would like to call attention to the following facts:

(1) No philosophy can deny that man has the power to know some things. Such a denial would be so absurd and contradictory as to make it unworthy of attention. Two statements would doubtless meet with universal approbation. One is that there are some things that man can know. The other is that there are limitations as to what he can know. Man can know some things; he can not know every thing. It would seem, then, that the point where men differ is as to how limited man's knowledge is.

(2) Man has an ineradicable craving for a spiritual object of reverence, trust and worship. Man is not satisfied with the seen and the transient. He longs for communion with the unseen and the abiding. It is man's nature to be religious. As Mr. James says,[1] men pray because they can not help it. Man feels himself limited and dependent. He longs to know one who is not thus limited and dependent—to whom he can look in his helplessness and in whom he can trust for help. When men convince themselves by their philosophies that there is no God whom they can know and trust, they immediately begin to personify Humanity, or Nature, or the Universe, write the word with a capital letter, and reverence and worship It. Unless there is a God that man can know and worship, then it seems that man is forever doomed to a fruitless search for one. He is so made that he must ceaselessly seek for that which he can not find and without which he can not be satisfied. If some demoniac power had wanted to create a being and guarantee his

[1] "Psychology," by William James.

eternal misery, surely he could not have better succeeded than to make him so that he must forever search for a God who did not exist and without a knowledge of whom the creature could not rest.

(3) Biblical religion always regards man as capable of knowing God. Man was created in the image of God. There was spiritual affinity between God and man. This explains the longing of man for God. Man is so made that he can not realize his true destiny apart from God. The reason he can not is because he is a spiritual being, made in God's image. He is made for God and can never be happy without God. This idea of man's spiritual capacity, his capacity for fellowship with God, finds supreme expression in the setting forth of Jesus Christ as the incarnation of God. In the idea and fact of the incarnation we have revealed the capacity of human nature for the divine. There is nothing here of the deistic view of human life as a realm foreign to God from which God was absent and with which he had nothing to do. Human nature is not atheistic in its constitution. Nor do we find an intimation here that the presence of God perverts human nature or keeps it from being truly human. The unlimited fulness of God's presence in Jesus did not make him less human but more. The incarnation is a revelation of the fact that human nature is spiritual in its constitution, that man has a capacity for God.

(4) Man's experience of fellowship with God in Christ is the answer to the question. The question, Can man know God? becomes the question, Does man know God? The only answer to this question is the answer of experience. To examine the experience of those who claim to have such fellowship is the only way to find the answer to the question. It can no more be settled in an off-hand, *a priori* way than one can settle by such a method the question, Can a man love his mother? We might speculate and decide that men could not love their

mothers, but the experience of one man to the contrary would be a sufficient demonstration that our conclusion was wrong. The crucial question then is not, Can men know God? but, Do men know God? This question can only be answered by an appeal to experience. This we will look at later.

We will see later on that there is a certain religious or spiritual attitude on man's part necessary to his having that fellowship with God that constitutes a true knowledge of him. In other words, God has revealed himself in Jesus Christ in that he has brought himself within the reach of man. But this historical and objective revelation of God in Jesus Christ must become the discovery of the individual man. Every man must know God for himself. To do so he must search for God. Each man must find God in an experience that carries with it its own assurance; that is, it is of such a nature that the one having the experience knows God and knows that he knows God.

CHAPTER II

OUR KNOWLEDGE OF GOD IN CHRIST

The Christian Claim

I. The objective revelation of God in Christ.
   1. Jesus' consciousness of God.
   2. The teaching of Jesus concerning God.
   3. The character and life of Jesus.
   4. The claims of Jesus concerning his relations to God.
      (1) That God sent him.
      (2) That he had a special knowledge of God.
      (3) That he mediated this knowledge to others.
   5. The redemptive work of Jesus.
      (1) He saves by the sacrifice of himself.
      (2) God sent him for this purpose.
      (3) This sacrifice of Jesus was a manifestation of the love of God.
      (4) The resurrection of Jesus was the work of God.
   6. Conclusion: that in Jesus Christ we have an objective, historical revelation of God.

II. Communion with God through faith in Christ—certain conditions on our part necessary to a knowledge of God as revealed in Christ.
   1. A new consciousness of God brought to men through Christ.
   2. Fellowship with God conditioned upon faith.
      (1) A moral rather than intellectual matter.
      (2) Renunciation of sin.
      (3) Self-surrender to Christ.
   3. Knowing God a redemptive experience.
   4. Evidence that this experience gives genuine knowledge of God.
      (1) Distinction between assurance that one knows and convincing others that one knows.
      (2) The experience of knowing God self-evidencing.

(3) Corroborative evidence.
a. The experience of others.
b. The transforming power of the experience.
(a) In the individual.
(b) In society.
c. The experience definitely conditioned.

III. Objections considered.

1. That one is asked to make the venture of faith before having the assurance that he knows God.
Answer: One may know enough about Christianity to justify the venture of faith that brings assurance.
2. That this so-called knowledge is purely subjective.
Answer: Faith is a response to the Christ historically and objectively revealed.
3. That religious reality is the object of faith, not of knowledge.
Answer:
(1) An element of faith in all knowledge.
(2) Faith the basis of all life's activities.
(3) Faith the response of a person to a person.
(4) Faith as spiritual vision.
(5) Faith its own assurance.
(6) Law of pedagogy that we learn by living.

IV. Some observations and conclusions.

1. The nature of revelation.
(1) Revelation as personal.
a. The medium a person.
b. Guarantees personality of God.
c. Knowledge of God dependent on personal adjustment.
d. Knowledge of spiritual truth a personal communication.
(2) Revelation put in human terms.
(3) God revealed in moral terms.
(4) Revelation a deed of redemption.
2. The purpose of revelation—not to give man a perfect system of theology or philosophy, but to make men like God in character.
3. The finality of the Christian revelation.
(1) The Christian assured that Christ is God's final revelation.
(2) Yet Christianity a religion of progress.
(3) Christianity the universal religion.

The Christian claim is that Jesus Christ is the revelation of God and that in him men have a true knowledge of God. This claim we now wish to set forth in its simplest form. Let us keep in mind the two factors spoken of in the last chapter, the objective and the subjective. We must also remember, however, that these two factors are so blended that there can be nothing like an absolute separation between the two.

I. **The objective revelation of God in Jesus Christ.** The Christian doctrine of revelation is that in Jesus Christ God has brought himself within the reach of all men; that he has given an objective, historical revelation of himself in human terms so that men, by compliance with certain spiritual conditions that are universal in their nature, may have fellowship with God. What we wish to do now is to notice some of the factors in this disclosure of himself.

1. Jesus' consciousness of God. One of the most noteworthy things about Jesus, a fact at once obvious and significant, is that he was a religious man. In his case, religion was not an element or factor in life, but it was the whole of life. All of life to him was sacred. The whole of life was lived in view of God and was consecrated to him. Every duty was duty to God. There was no sphere of life in which God was not recognized. There was no element in life that was secular, nothing that was common or unclean. God was recognized as the Source of every blessing and as the Master of destiny for this world and the world to come. Every good thing was to be received with thanksgiving as God's gift.

His life was one of unclouded fellowship with God. He was distinguished not only by the fact that he was a man whose whole life was religious, but also by the further fact that his communion with God was unbroken. It was his meat and drink to do the will of God. The consciousness of God was to him the breath of life.

Never did he betray the least consciousness of disharmony or lack of fellowship with God. The earliest recorded saying we have from him was, "Knew ye not that I must be in my Father's house?"[1] while with his expiring breath he said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."[2] His whole life was one of obedience to God. Rather than deny the Father's will he drank the bitter cup of suffering and death on the cross.

2. The teaching of Jesus concerning God. Another factor in Jesus' revelation of God was his teaching concerning God. Jesus was a religious teacher, and central in his teaching was his doctrine of God. It is generally held by all classes of students of the New Testament that Jesus' teaching concerning God is the highest the world has ever seen. He is a God of perfect wisdom and power. There is no doubt about the personality of God in the conception of Jesus. To him God was no abstract principle or impersonal power or pantheistic absolute. He was a person of perfect righteousness and love. He is good to the evil as well as to the good; he sends the rain on the unjust as well as on the just.[3] This goodness to the evil is the chief element in his perfect character, the one that should be imitated by men if they would be true sons of the Father. His character can be summed up in the name Father. He is interested in all that concerns his children on earth. The very hairs of their head are all numbered. Not a sparrow falls to the ground without his notice.[4] His people can trust him to supply their every need.[5] He knows beforehand what they need and they can therefore pray to him with confidence that he will supply their need.[6] He does not give evil things but good, in answer to the prayers of his people.[7] His mercy is extended to sinners and he will gladly receive them when they repent and

[1]Luke 2: 49.
[2]Luke 23: 46.
[3]Matt. 5: 43-48.
[4]Matt. 10: 29, 30.
[5]Matt. 6: 25ff.
[6]Matt. 6: 6-8.
[7]Matt. 7: 7-11.

come to him.[1] We are not to interpret this to mean, however, that the sterner qualities are absent from the character of God as taught by Jesus. He warns men to fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.[2] The man who has the spirit of hatred toward his brother or the spirit of unforgiveness, and manifests this spirit in hasty and unbrotherly language is in danger ot the judgment and the hell of fire.[3]

3. The character and life of Jesus. Another thing that enters as an important factor into Jesus' revelation of God is his spotless character and life of service to God and man. Jesus was the perfect embodiment and representation of his own teaching. He was all that he taught. He held up before men the perfect character of God as the ideal toward which they were to strive.[4] No disciple of Jesus has ever been able to reach that high ideal. But what about Jesus? With him the story is different. He was the embodiment in human form of the holy life of God. No man could have a higher aspiration in the realm of character than to desire to be like him. He so lived among men that to be like him became the passion of the noblest souls who knew him.

This perfect character of Jesus was the exponent in human form of the holy character of God. When Jesus was accused of eating with publicans and sinners, his answer was to admit the charge and then to give three parables to show that God loved sinners, held them as of practically infinite value and stood ready to forgive the penitent prodigal.[5] What was this but to say that his love for sinners and outcasts was the love of God? And sinners from that day to this have so taken it and by coming to Christ have found the forgiving love of God. Jesus said that he cast out demons in the power of God.[6] His works of healing and blessing men were the

[1]Luke 15.
[2]Matt. 10: 28.
[3]Matt. 5: 21-26.
[4]Matt. 5: 48.
[5]Luke 15.
[6]Matt. 12: 22ff.

method by which the benevolence of God manifested itself toward sinful and needy humanity. The works of Jesus were the works of the Father and were a manifestation of his unity with the Father.[1]

One of the outstanding features in the life of Jesus was his miracles. By means of these he showed himself to be the Lord of nature, as when he walked on the water, turned the water into wine or fed the five thousand. He manifested his superiority over the evil forces of disease by healing the bodies of men. He cast out demons and thus proved himself Lord of the spiritual world. By raising the dead he revealed himself as Master of life and death. Surely such a one as this can not be measured by the standards of human nature alone. Divine powers are working in him.

4. The claims of Jesus concerning his relations to God. In connection with the teaching of Jesus concerning God and the character of Jesus as the embodiment of the moral life of God, it will be well to look at the claims of Jesus concerning his relations with God. Here we will notice about three distinct, but related, claims on the part of Jesus.

(1) One is that God sent him into the world. Jesus lived his life under the sense of a divine mission. His one desire was to do the work for which God sent him into the world. He was distinctly conscious that he came forth from God on a mission; to the accomplishment of this mission he gave his life.[2]

(2) Jesus also laid claim to a special and intimate knowledge of God, a knowledge of God that did not belong to any other. He says, "Neither doth any know the Father, save the Son."[3] Jesus here lays claim to a direct and immediate knowledge of God that other men did not have. Again, speaking of the Father, he says,

[1]John 14: 10, 11.
[2]John 4: 34; 5: 30; 6: 38.
[3]Matt. 11: 27.

"I know him; because I am from him, and he sent me."[1] Talking about himself as the good shepherd Jesus says that he knows his sheep, "even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father."[2] This knowledge of God that Jesus claims is knowledge that grows out of direct spiritual communion between the Father and the Son.

(3) Jesus furthermore claims to be the sole mediator of such a knowledge to men. No one knows the Father, save the Son, "and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him."[3] Here is the astonishing claim that all other men are dependent on him for a knowledge of God. His own knowledge of God is direct and immediate; that of other men is mediated by him. In this realm all things have been committed to him of the Father. He is the Lord of this realm. Other men are dependent on him. God reveals himself to other men only through the Son.

In harmony with this is the claim of Jesus to forgive sins.[4] This claim he made and worked a miracle to prove his claim true.

5. The redemptive work of Jesus. An essential element in Jesus' revelation of God is the redemptive work accomplished by Jesus on behalf of man. He says that the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost.[5] His was a redemptive mission. He was a Savior as signified by the name Jesus.[6] What we are here concerned about is to show that the work of Jesus in redeeming man is a revelation of God. This can be shown in the following statements.

(1) Jesus saves men by the sacrifice of himself. The cross was the redemptive achievement of Christ in which he gave himself for us. He laid down his life for his sheep. This was a voluntary accomplishment on his part.[7] He gave his life a ransom for many.[8] Every-

[1]John 7: 29.
[2]John 10: 15.
[3]Matt. 11: 27.
[4]Mark 2: 5.
[5]Luke 19: 10.
[6]Matt. 1: 21.
[7]John 10: 17, 18.
[8]Mark 10: 45.

where in the New Testament the cross of Jesus stands for his saving act. We are redeemed by his precious blood.[1] He redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us.[2]

(2) He was sent by the Father for this purpose of giving himself. God gave his Son that whosoever believeth on him should have everlasting life.[3] This act of Jesus was an act of obedience to God.[4] It was in obedience to the will of God that in Gethsemane he gained his final consent to drink the cup of woe for mankind.[5]

(3) This sacrificial work of Jesus was a manifestation of the love of God for sinful men. God so loved the world that he gave his Son.[6] God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.[7] The New Testament Christians saw in the cross of Christ two things: God's condemnation of sin and his love for the sinner. Here is the center of Christianity—the cross as a redemptive achievement on the part of God and a revelation of God's heart of love for mankind. The New Testament does not look on the cross simply as the death of a man, however noble and good, but as a divine sacrifice prompted by divine love. It was the disclosure of grace on God's part for sinful and undeserving men. Here is the final revelation of the heart of God.

(4) As an integral part of the redemptive work of Jesus and the culmination of it, the resurrection of Jesus was the work of God. Peter told the people on the day of Pentecost that this Jesus, whom they had crucified, God raised from the dead and exalted to his right hand, the position of supreme authority and power.[8] It is not simply the Jesus who lived among men on earth and died on the cross that reveals God to men; it is this

[1]1 Peter 1: 19. [2]Gal. 3: 13. [3]John 3: 16. [4]Phil. 2: 8. [5]Mark 14: 36. [6]John 3: 16. [7]Rom. 5: 8. [8]Acts 2: 32, 33.

same Jesus who also rose from the dead and ascended to glory. One who denies that Jesus thus conquered death and was enthroned at the right hand of God is entirely consistent in denying that through him we get a unique and unparalleled knowledge of God.

6. Conclusion. We might sum up the point that in Jesus we have a historical and objective revelation of God in the language of the fourth Gospel. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."[1] Here the writer says that the God whom men had never been able to bring within the range of their vision had been brought within their knowledge by the only begotten Son. He has stated in the first verse of the chapter that the eternal Word was with God and was himself God. Then he says that all things have come to be through him (vs. 3). This Word he tells us became flesh and tabernacled among us and men beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father (vs. 14). This eternal Word is the revelation of the Father. He is absolutely divine in nature, he is God (vs. 1). Yet he is personally distinct from the Father and eternally had communion with the Father—he was with God (vs. 1), and is in the bosom of the Father (vs. 18), has intimate fellowship with him, hence knows him, and can therefore reveal him in truth. The method of the revelation was that he came into his world, the world that was made through his mediating agency (vs. 3), and thus by living a human life on earth brought a concrete, historical revelation of God within the reach of men. The eternal Word of life had thus been heard, seen, beheld and handled.[2]

II. **Communion with God through faith in Christ.** It is not claimed that the above mentioned facts alone give one a knowledge of God. These facts must be consid-

[1]John 1: 18. [2]1 John 1: 1, 2.

ered in their relation to faith, the act by which one responds to Christ in such a way as to come to know God. A statement of these facts alone will not enable one to understand how the Christian knows God any more than a statement of facts about the physical world would enable one to understand how one knows that world. To understand how one knows the physical world we must give some attention to sense perception and the activity of the perceiving mind in the act of knowing the world. So in understanding how one knows God we must give some attention to the act of faith, the response to Christ and his saving work by which one comes into fellowship with God and knows God. Or, to use another illustration, in order to understand how man is nourished by means of food one must not only study something about foods and their properties, he must also give some attention to the act of eating and the process of digestion. One would never know how the body is nourished if he did not study foods in their relation to the body, and study the body in relation to foods. He must see how different foods actually affect the body and how the body is actually affected by different foods. There is the capacity and act of appropriation as well as the thing appropriated. And we can not understand the thing appropriated except as related to the act of appropriation and the way it functions as thus appropriated. So to understand Jesus Christ as the revelation of God we must consider the facts about him in relation to the appropriating faith of Christians and in the effects produced by this appropriation. In other words, the proper procedure for us is not to look at the facts about Christ as recorded in the New Testament and speculate as to whether men through him can find God: it is rather to ask, first of all, whether or not men have found God through him; and if so upon what conditions. It is thus, first of all, a question of fact. And if men have actually found God in

Christ, that is itself a fact that must be accounted for; it must be explained, not explained away. Our question then might be put as follows. Have men found God in Christ? Or what evidence do we have that men have found God in Christ?

1. A new consciousness of God through Christ. In answer to this question, it is evident from the New Testament records that Christ brought to men a new consciousness of God. Of course in saying that men find God in Christ we do not mean that men had no consciousness of God before the days of Jesus or apart from the historical Christ. But it is perfectly evident, not only that Jesus had a distinct consciousness of God, as previously pointed out, but also that he succeeded in imparting to men a new consciousness of God. This he did during his earthly life. There was something about his life and teaching that brought to men a new sense of God and his love. But even more distinctly after his departure did men come into a consciousness of God through their faith in the risen Christ. In this respect it proved to be expedient for them that he should go away. As an example of this new consciousness of God that came to men through Christ, we might take the work of the disciples in the early chapters of Acts. At Pentecost they were all "filled with the Holy Spirit."[1] Whatever else this signified, it meant that they were taken possession of by a consciousness of the divine presence. They were intoxicated with this power that possessed them. When Peter and John were charged not to speak or teach in the name of Jesus, they answered: "Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than God, judge ye."[2] Against human authority, they appealed to divine. God was more real to them than the Jewish Sanhedrin. Teaching in the name of Jesus was to them obedience to God.

[1]Acts 2: 4. [2]Acts 4: 19.

These New Testament Christians bear witness that this consciousness of God came to them through Jesus Christ. The gospel of Christ was to them the power of God. But not only do we find the Christians of the New Testament testifying that in Christ they found God, but we also find a line of witnesses from the New Testament age down to the present testifying to the same thing. These witnesses we find in multitudes to-day. They are of all ages, races, nationalities and grades of culture. Their testimony is a unit on the point that in Christ they came into fellowship with God. And we do not find men of any other religious faith bearing testimony to a similar knowledge of God. Such witnesses arise wherever the gospel is preached and only where it is preached. No other message or doctrine produces in men such a consciousness of God and his love for man.

2. Fellowship with God conditioned upon faith. Upon what condition or conditions does one come into this fellowship with God? How may one come into possession of this knowledge of God in Christ Jesus? The conditions of fellowship with God may be summed up in the word faith. This word describes the fundamental moral and spiritual attitude necessary to fellowship with God, as that attitude is described in the New Testament and known in Christian experience.

We need to understand that the attitude described by this term is moral and spiritual rather than merely intellectual. In other words, faith is not an activity of the intellect primarily, but an attitude of heart and will. It is not belief of a doctrine. Accepting a doctrine as such is not faith. Faith is fundamentally the attitude of a person to a person. Attitude toward truth is one element in faith, to be sure; but it is primarily moral and spiritual truth, truth that describes the relation of a person to a person. It is truth that has to do with moral relations, not truth that is speculative or abstract. As related to truth, faith is an attitude of willingness to

accept truth so far as known, and to act on it. It is the attitude of obedience to truth. Without this attitude one can not know the truth in the moral and spiritual realm. This is made clear in John's Gospel. A willingness to do the truth leads to a progressive knowledge of the truth; the opposite attitude leads to darkness and death. This implies fidelity to right in the highest form known to the soul.

This necessitates as the obverse side of this moral attitude a renunciation of sin. The opposite attitude of faith is the one described in John's Gospel as loving darkness rather than light.[1] Faith is a renunciation of moral darkness. It is a forsaking of darkness to come to the light. This is the attitude described in places in the New Testament as repentance. Especially in the fourth Gospel, this attitude is regarded as an element or aspect of faith.

Faith in its final and characteristic form is receptivity toward Christ as Savior and self-surrender to him as Lord. In cases where the soul has not been sufficiently enlightened to receive Christ as Savior and Lord, it is receptivity and self-surrender to the truth about God so far as that truth has been revealed to the soul. It is loyalty to the highest and best the soul knows in the moral and spiritual realm. Unbelief is the opposite of this. It is rejection of moral and spiritual light. It is moral cowardice. It is denial of truth and right, particularly denial of Christ who is truth and light. This attitude makes a knowledge of God impossible; but faith is the bond of union between the soul and God. By faith every avenue between the soul and God is opened up. The believing soul lives in God and God in the soul.

3. Knowing God a redemptive experience. This knowledge of God is evidently a matter of inner spiritual

[1] 3: 19.

experience. Let us now look more carefully at what kind of an experience this finding of God is.

It is everywhere apparent in the New Testament, and confirmed by Christian experience, that knowing God is inseparable from an experience of redemption. To experience salvation and to know God are one and the same. It is sin that destroys man's fellowship with God; so that to be saved from sin means to come back into fellowship with him. This does not mean that the New Testament writers reasoned that sin broke man's fellowship with God and that salvation from sin would restore this fellowship, and gave us in the New Testament their reasoning on the subject. Instead of that, we have the record of the experience of men who found God in the experience of salvation. The New Testament is the record of experience in God's dealings with men, not the record of the philosophizings of men about God.

The fact that knowing God is inseparable from an experience of salvation can be made evident in two or three statements. In John's Gospel knowing God means to come into possession of eternal life. This is made clear in the statement in 17: 3: "This is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." Whether the author means that eternal life is the result of knowing God or that eternal life is identical with knowing God, it is clear that eternal life is inseparable from a knowledge of God and that a knowledge of God is inseparable from eternal life. The two are so related that one is impossible without the other, if they are not two views or aspects of the same spiritual experience.

In Paul's teaching this knowledge of God comes in a revolutionary experience that he calls justification, reconciliation, adoption or a new creation. This experience that brings one into a new relationship with God is fundamental to any true knowledge of God. In this experience the Spirit of sonship is given to one, and he

recognizes God as Father. Moreover, one is given the power of spiritual discernment so that he can understand and know spiritual truth. The natural mind can not discern spiritual truth. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned.[1] This agrees with the saying of Jesus that except one be born again, he cannot *see* the kingdom of God; he can not discern its values and understands its truth.[2]

In agreement with the teaching of Paul is the teaching of the book of Hebrews.[3] Quoting Jeremiah, the author shows that one element in the new covenant is that God will put his laws into the minds of his people, and write them on their hearts. They will not need any one to teach them to know the Lord, for they shall know him from the least to the greatest. Then (vs. 12) he shows that this universal knowledge of God grows out of the fact that he is merciful to their iniquities and will no more remember their sins. The forgiveness of sins means the knowledge of God.

Enough has been said to show that this knowledge of God is an experience of redemption. It is in the consciousness of being saved from sin that one comes into fellowship with God and knows God.

4. Evidence that this experience gives genuine knowledge of God. But the question arises: What proof or satisfactory evidence do we have that this inner experience that we speak of gives a true knowledge of God?

(1) A distinction to be made. Here we must distinguish two questions. One is the assurance of the man who has the experience that in the experience he knows God. The other is the evidence to the man who does not have the experience. But we have here only the distinction that must be made in the case of all knowledge. It is always one thing to have the experience of knowing; it is another to convince another

[1]1 Cor. 2: 14. [2]John 3: 3. [3]8: 10-12.

person that you know. The other person must depend on the testimony of the one who has the experience, together with certain corroborative evidences to which he may appeal. And that is exactly the case with the experience of knowing God. The one who does not have the experience may consider certain evidences that will confirm the testimony of the one who does experience fellowship with God.

(2) The experience of knowing God self-evidencing. But so far as the experience of knowing God is concerned, it carries its own assurance within itself. How does one know that he knows God? He knows just as he knows that he knows anything else. He knows by virtue of the fact that knowledge in any realm carries its own assurance. There is never any thing outside the act of knowing to which one can appeal by which he can prove that in the act of knowing he truly knows. Knowledge is always self-evidencing. Does this mean that one always knows when he thinks he knows? No; but it does mean that there is nothing outside the consciousness of knowing to which one can appeal to prove to oneself that he really knows. Not that we are denying that one may be convinced that there is a God before having this experience of fellowship with God; we are persuaded that with most men, if not all, that is true. But what we are affirming is that this experience of fellowship with God is not dependent on something outside itself for its certainty as to God. It goes without saying that one must have the capacity to know God; but the best evidence that man does have such capacity is found in the experience itself of knowing God. So, too, the best evidence that any man can have that there is a God is to be found in the experience of fellowship with God. Personal acquaintance with God is the best assurance that there is a God.

(3) Corroborative evidence. While the main evidence for the knowledge of God lies in the experience itself,

that is, in the testimony of consciousness that we know God; yet there are certain things that accompany and follow this experience that tend to verify the belief that in this experience we have a genuine knowledge of God.

a. The experience of others. If one never found any one else who had had a similar experience, he might doubt the testimony of his own consciousness and think that his sense of fellowship with God was illusory. But instead of that, he finds that multitudes of others have had the same kind of an experience. From the days of the New Testament down to the present, multitudes in every age have testified that by faith in Christ they came into fellowship with God. And, as pointed out above, it is not confined to any one class or condition of men. If it were, then it might be thought that there was something in that class of men, something accidental or incidental in its nature, that would account for the experience. But the prevalence of the experience precludes that inference. Then these experiences are alike in their essential features. There is quite a variety among these experiences in some respects, but especially on the point about which we are now concerned, that of finding in Christ a consciousness that one knows God, there is general agreement. If only one person, or even a few, or people of one class or nationality had this experience, we might afford to set the experience aside without serious consideration. But since many people of all nationalities, grades of culture and social condition, of every age since the days of Jesus, have testified that in him they have found God in a religious experience, then their testimony is worthy of consideration as offering to us the hope that here we have a genuine knowledge.

b. The transforming power of the experience. (a) In the life of the individual. Another thing to be kept in mind is the fact that this experience is one that gives moral and spiritual inspiration and power. In the lives

of many men it has been nothing less than a moral revolution. Attention was called above to the fact that this experience was primarily an experience of salvation. That is what it is looking at it from the inner side, so to speak, from the standpoint of the consciousness of the one who has the experience. What we are here thinking of is the result in the outward life, in its moral and social results.

Oftentimes the libertine has been led to a life of purity, the drunkard to a life of soberness, the profane swearer to a life of reverence, the thief and the gambler to a life of honesty and honor. One of the most characteristic things about the Christian experience of fellowship with God in Christ is that, along with love to God, it implants in man's heart an unselfish love to his fellowman. It thus leads to all sorts of moral and social readjustments. It makes of the selfish man an unselfish servant of his fellow man. This statement holds in spite of the fact that many professing Christians do not live up to the Christian ideal in this respect. Those who criticise professing Christians for not living up to the ideal should remember that the very ideal of an unselfish life is a creation of Christianity and that even to-day the ideal is not accepted by many people in so-called Christian lands. Not only is the ideal a creation of Christianity, but also the love necessary to drive out man's natural selfishness and produce a life of sacrificial service is to be found nowhere except in Christianity.

Whatever other tests may be applied to any religion claiming to bring men into fellowship with God, no religion is worthy of consideration that can not meet the moral test. By their fruits ye shall know them. Any religion that does not produce righteous men and women need not ask us to believe that it offers us any real hope of coming into fellowship with God. It might offer us all sorts of miraculous prodigies as evidence,

but these we would set aside as bare marvels or tricks of some juggler if it could not meet the moral test. It might overwhelm our intellects with argument, but it could not win the permanent loyalty and adherence of men unless it offered such moral and spiritual fruits as appealed to the consciences and hearts of men. When it comes to meeting the demands of the moral claim, Christianity has no rival.

(b) In society. This morally transforming power of Christianity is seen in society as well as in the lives of individuals. Christianity came into a world that was sunken and sodden in sin. And while no one would claim that anything like a complete reign of righteousness has yet begun on the earth, yet undoubtedly the world has felt the uplifting power of Christianity. New ideals of righteousness have been introduced into human society. Some great social evils have been eradicated and others are being attacked. Slavery is practically a thing of the past. The whiskey traffic is going. Other great evils will follow. The recent great war has made some people pessimistic with reference to the power of the gospel to transform human society. But war will go. We must remember that these great social evils have been fastening their power on the race for thousands of years. Is it fair to pronounce the gospel of Christ a failure because it has not in nineteen centuries uprooted all the great evils that have been growing for many millenniums? Instead of saying that the world war is a demonstration of the failure of the gospel of Christ, would it not be nearer the truth to say that it demonstrates that everything else has failed and that it is now time to give the gospel a fair chance to see what it can do?

Taking a long look at the situation, we can undoubtedly say that the gospel is slowly introducing higher ideals of righteousness into our world and slowly lifting the world up toward those ideals.

c. The experience definitely conditioned. Another thing to keep in mind concerning this matter is that this experience of fellowship with God in Christ is definitely conditioned. These conditions are religious conditions. No other conditions in the nature of the case could apply. As religious, these conditions have to do with man's inner life. They concern primarily his relationship to God. They may include, however, his relation to his fellow man, but only as secondary, only as his relation to God includes his relation to man.

There can be no communion with God outside of the attitude of faith on man's part. Faith is the attitude of fellowship toward God on the part of man. Faith is not then something which God has prescribed in an arbitrary way for man to perform before he will condescend to commune with man. It is rather the attitude of communion with God on man's part, to which God is striving, by a manifestation of himself in Christ, to win man. Of course, then, if man will not assume this attitude toward God, there can be no communion between God and man.

Or to put the matter still more accurately, there are no "prescribed" conditions for coming into fellowship with God; that is, no conditions that are prescribed in an external or arbitrary way. The only condition is that a man desire that fellowship, that he repudiate that which hinders it and makes it impossible, and then respond to the call of the God who is striving to win man into fellowship with himself. The only conditions are those that are involved in the necessary relationship of a God of grace to a sinful race of men whom he would win into fellowship with himself.

The important thing for us in this connection is that no one comes into this conscious and joyous fellowship with God except those who turn and become as little children. If it be objected that these conditions are inward and subjective and, therefore, not matters of scien-

tific investigation, we would ask: Are not inner experiences as real as outward things? Are not moral facts as real as any? Is not love as real a force as gravity? Is not hate as hard as flint? Is not spiritual joy as exhilarating as mountain air? Does not faith have as much to do with the everyday affairs of life as cold cash? Is not thought as real as things?

But the fact that there are definite conditions to be met on man's part, or a certain moral attitude on man's part which he must assume in order to come into fellowship with God—this fact shows that this experience of fellowship with God is not an accidental or lawless matter. It can be studied in relation to certain definite moral conditions that must be met in order to know God.

III. **Objections considered.** The view set forth here, that one knows God in the experience of redemption through faith in Christ, has certain objections urged against it which we now consider.

1. That one is asked to make the venture of faith before having the assurance that he knows God.

Of course, one must make the venture of faith before having the assurance that comes from faith. This is true in the case of any knowledge that grows out of experience. One can never have the knowledge that comes from any particular experience before he has the experience. This is self-evident. With reference to the matter before us, this simply means that there is a knowledge of God that comes from religious experience that can not come any other way. If knowing God is to be a matter of any vital concern to man, it is difficult to see how it could be any other way.

But the question arises: Since this knowledge of God is conditioned upon faith and one can not have the knowledge without faith, is this not asking one to exercise faith without having a proper basis of fact for faith? Does it not make faith a venture in the dark, almost a matter of superstition?

The answer is in the negative. We must remember that, while this experience of fellowship with God in Christ is a definite type of experience and yields a knowledge of God that men can not have any other way, still it does not mean that before having this experience men are in total ignorance with reference to God. There are certain facts with reference to the Christian revelation that are the common possession of men in a Christian land, besides the knowledge of God that may come to men in other ways. This shows also that the spiritual discernment of which we have been speaking is not something unrelated to our ordinary powers of knowledge. In fact, the powers of mind and heart exercised in religious faith and discernment are the same powers used in other knowledge. The difference is that they are turned in a different direction or toward a different object, and inspired and guided by a new power, the divine Spirit. Before exercising Christian faith, then, one may have enough knowledge of the facts of Christianity intelligently to exercise faith in God as revealed in Christ. This does not guarantee that there are never any elements of error or superstition connected with the religious faith of Christians. This is no more true than it is true that our knowelge in other realms is sun-clear and free from error.

As a matter of fact, Christian faith is the intelligent and free response of the soul to God as revealed in Christ, on the basis of what the soul knows of such a revelation. Faith is the response of the soul to the intelligent presentation of the gospel of Christ. The gospel comes to man as a rational and free being and wins from him an intelligent and voluntary response. He responds to knowledge; but what we have been insisting on is that there grows out of this response a direct, spiritual knowledge of God that can not come any other way. This is in accordance with what we know of the way man ac-

quires knowledge in other realms—knowledge comes from experience.

2. That this so-called knowledge is purely subjective. This objection is often urged against religious knowledge as growing out of religious experience. There is a subjective phase to religious knowledge. We have already pointed out that there is an objective and a subjective phase to all knowledge. There is always the object known and the activity of the knowing mind. Religious knowledge is in this respect like all other knowledge.

Christian faith is objectively grounded. Christianity is a historical religion. The object of Christian faith is not simply an ethical or philosophical ideal unrelated to history or definitely cognizable objective reality. It is the Christ who came into history, the record of whose redemptive work we have in the New Testament, that we trust for salvation. Here is an order of fact to be grasped by the mind as any other order of fact is. Then one can also know what Christ has done for the history of the world. He can see his transforming power in the lives of others around him. He can hear the testimony of those who have trusted him and found peace and spiritual freedom in doing so. One can know of his spotless life and ministry of service as recorded in the New Testament, as well as his claim to the loyalty and confidence of men and his claim to reveal God to men. Do not these facts constitute an objective basis for Christian faith? Can we not in view of these facts trust him as intelligently for religious help and strength as we trust our money to the bank or commit ourselves to the train for transportation?

Of course, it is true that the risen Christ as the object of religious faith is not now visible to the physical eye. He is not now discoverable to the physical senses. But certainly one would not be justifiable in limiting reality to that which is realizable through the physical senses alone. That would reduce reality to the physical.

3. That religious reality is the object of faith, not of knowledge. There are those who will object to the idea that the Christian gets knowledge through Christian experience on the ground that the supposed knowledge comes as a result of faith and faith is not knowledge. In fact, many would set faith and knowledge over against each other in strong contrast. Even some religious men would accept this idea of faith.

There is a general attitude in recent times that says that in religion we can not know, we can only believe. Faith has to do with one realm, knowledge with another. Up to a certain point we may have knowledge, beyond that we can only believe. Many who assume this attitude would say that any man who is willing to take the risk has the right to make the venture of faith. Some would say that it is more rational than not to make the venture. Man's nature and religious needs urge him on to make the venture of faith. It is best, therefore, to make it. Many others would hold that faith is only a form of superstition to be tolerated in those who do not yet have sufficient rational light to give up their superstition. But on the part of all it would be said that there is little, if any, certainty to be had in this realm, and we would not be justified in speaking of it as knowledge.

We would not deny that there is an element of venture in faith. We would maintain that there is. But we would deny that there are two distinct spheres, one in which you can have knowledge, the other in which you can only believe without knowing. Much that was said in answer to the two preceding objections will apply to this, especially what was said about religious faith as objectively grounded. In addition we call attention to the following facts:

(1) An element of faith in all knowledge. Our knowledge of the physical world comes to us through our physical senses. Outside of the testimony of our senses we have no knowledge of that world. Without these senses

that world for us would be non-existent. These senses are our only means of coming into contact with that world. But suppose one is not willing to accept the testimony of his senses as to that world and would, therefore, deny the accuracy of our knowledge of that world or even deny the reality of the external world. Suppose he demands proof, apart from the use of his senses, that his senses are reliable and, therefore, that our knowledge of the external world is reliable and accurate. To what could you appeal, outside of the testimony of the senses, to prove that your senses were reliable? Absolutely nothing. You can not prove that your senses are reliable; that is, you can not give any evidence outside of the testimony of the senses themselves.

But do not your senses sometimes deceive you? Yes. But how did you find it out? By a more accurate use of your senses. How do you correct the mistakes of your senses? By a more careful use of your senses. You do not correct the mistakes of your senses by appealing to something outside of the senses. You can not, for the simple reason that in the realm where your senses give you knowledge there is nothing else to appeal to. There is no other means of getting into touch with that realm, no other means of knowing it.

One can, therefore, assume that his senses are trustworthy, or he can assume the opposite. But he can not prove by argument either one. The business of life goes on a good deal better, however, if one assumes that his senses are trustworthy. If he assumes this and acts accordingly the business of life will ordinarily go on very well. But if he assumes the opposite and acts according to his assumption, the business of life will not go on at all. As a matter of fact, then, we all do assume it. We trust our senses. We proceed on the assumption that they can be trusted, and when we do so the assumption justifies itself in its practical results. The oposite as-

sumpton no one can act on. It is an assumption which at once paralyzes all life's activities.

No one can assume that his senses are untrustworthy and then live according to his assumption. Mrs. Eddy says that the senses are not to be trusted because they often give us false reports. But she does not act on her own statement, for she is constantly appealing to the testimony of the senses to prove what her system has done for men. She appeals to the testimony of the senses to prove that men have been healed by her method. Well, if the senses can not be trusted, what right has she to appeal to their testimony? Nobody else who makes Mrs. Eddy's assumption will be any more successful in living according to the assumption than she was. All this has been said to show that there is an element of faith in all knowledge. Before we can know anything of the physical world we must trust our senses. All our knowledge of the external world is based on confidence and trust in our senses.

Again, in our mental processes we trust our minds. No man can prove that the operations of his mind are trustworthy. How could he do so except by appealing to his mind? But he would have no right to appeal to his mind to prove that his mind was reliable. He would have to assume the very thing that he started out to prove.

The simplest acts of sense perception or the most elementary processes of thought are based on faith in our senses and in the trustworthiness of our minds. Such a thing as knowledge without faith is impossible.

(2) Faith the basis of all life's activities. Another thing worthy of consideration is that faith is the basis of all the affairs of life. Every time a man posts a letter, buys a railroad ticket, makes a deposit in the bank, he exercises faith. What effect would it have on business, government, social and domestic life, if the confidence of man in man should be destroyed? Faith is not a re-

ligious principle exclusively. It is the basis of human society, of the family, of government. In the ordinary affairs of life it is looked on as a rational principle. Why should it be thought, then, the antithesis of knowledge in the religious realm?

As in the religious realm, so in other realms of human interest and activity, faith may be misplaced or misguided. But that is no reason why we should say that, therefore, faith is always blind and synonymous with superstition. Faith should be intelligent in any realm of life. But our contention is that faith may be intelligent in the religious realm as in other realms; that faith and intelligence or knowledge should not be looked upon as opposed to each other, or mutually exclusive.

(3) Faith the response of a person to a person. Faith, then, is not an act or attitude of superstitious or blind reverence toward an unknown God, an ethical or philosophical ideal, or the mysterious Infinite. It is an intelligent and trustful response of a person to a personal God who has revealed himself as a God of redemptive purpose and love in Jesus Christ. It is an act of man's undivided personality. It involves his whole personality. It is not simply an emotional response, or a blind act of the will, but involves the whole man. Faith is trust in God as known or revealed in Christ. The more one knows of God the more confidence he has in God, just as knowledge of a good man inspires confidence and trust; on the other hand, trust in God leads to a deeper knowledge of God. Trust and knowledge go together.

(4) Faith a spiritual vision. Instead of regarding faith as a blindly superstitious act or attitude, it would be nearer the truth to regard faith as the power of spiritual vision. This is the way it is regarded in Hebrews 11. It is the ground or confidence of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen (verse 1). It is that power of the soul by which one rises above limitations of the present and of the world of sense and lays hold of com-

ing and spiritual realities. By faith Moses saw him who is invisible (verse 27). Faith is the power of the soul to realize, that is, to make real to itself, spiritual and eternal things. The invisible God can be seen by the eye of faith. This is easier, doubtless, in the case of the Christian than in the case of Moses, because for us God has been objectively revealed in a human life. No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him.[1] And since God has thus been disclosed and set forth in Christ, we can the more easily see him with the eye of faith.

Faith, then, is not opposed to knowledge. Paul sets it in contrast to sight,[2] but it is natural vision or sight that he is talking about, while in Hebrews 11 it is viewed as the power of spiritual vision. That is, faith sees realities which the natural eye or the natural mind can not see. To the eye of faith these things become real. Or to change the figure, faith is the hand by which we reach up and lay hold of God. By the touch of faith God becomes real to the soul and his power comes into the life.

Faith, then, bears something of the same relation to the spiritual world that the physical senses do to the natural world. By means of it we come into living contact with the spiritual world. That world becomes real to us.

It is not, then, opposed to knowledge. It is the only means of knowledge in the spiritual realm. Just as we can not know the physical world except by the physical senses, so we can not know the spiritual world, at least in any real and living way, except by faith. Faith, then, is the only means of knowledge in the spiritual realm. A man who should boast of his lack of faith on the ground that it is an evidence of intelligence is only boasting of his own spiritual blindness. If one physically blind is to be pitied, how much more one who is spiritually blind!

[1]John 1: 18. [2]1 Cor. 13.

This is not negatived by what has been said about faith as related to an objective order of facts or Christianity as a social and historical order. For, while it is true that this objective or historical order of facts is known as any other order of facts is known, yet this knowledge does not become spiritual knowledge until one responds in faith to the Christ there made known. The proper response to this order of facts is faith and only this response of faith brings spiritual knowledge. In the act of responding in faith spiritual knowledge arises.

In no other way can man have the knowledge that satisfies the soul or meets the needs of his religious life. Faith is the proper response to the Christian revelation. Faith is the means of spiritual knowledge.

(5) Faith its own assurance. If now someone insists on having some guarantee or assurance outside of faith itself, that faith does give a real knowledge of God, that faith is not an empty superstition, the only answer that can be given is that there is no such assurance. In the last analysis, faith as a knowledge of God must be its own vindication. It must carry with it its own assurance. And there is no way by which one who does not live the life of faith can have the assurance that comes only from faith. Does faith give a knowledge of God? The only answer to that question must come from the experience of faith itself.

Reference was made above to the fact that there was the element of venture in faith. There is the element of venture. And one must not expect to have before making the venture the knowledge that can come only from the venture itself. That would be to say that, so far as knowledge is concerned, spiritual experience was to count for nothing. All that one has a right to ask before making the venture is knowledge enough to justify the venture. And this one has in Christianity as a historical and social force in the world.

There is no way outside of faith itself of guaranteeing that faith will give a true knowledge of God. There is no way outside of faith of testing the matter out to see if faith gives the knowledge desired, just as there is no way outside of sense experience to see if sense experience gives us a knowledge of the external world. How do we know that in sense experience we get a knowledge of a world external to ourselves, a world which exists independently of our consciousness? The only way to know is through sense experience itself. In that experience we are conscious that we come to know such a world. If one will not accept the testimony of consciousness on that point, there is nothing else to which one can appeal that will convince the skeptic. There is nothing outside of the testimony of consciousness in sense experience to prove to us that in sense experience we get knowledge of a real world existing objectively to us. In the same way there is nothing outside of the experience of faith to prove that in faith we come to know God. The man who exercises faith is conscious that in the act of faith he comes to God. There is nothing outside of the experience of faith to which he can appeal to prove that in the act of faith he knows God. The man who makes that kind of a demand is demanding the impossible. The man who exercises faith is fully assured in his own heart that he knows God. He is as clear and definite on that point as he is that in sense experience he knows the physical world. But outside of spiritual experience itself there is nothing to which he can appeal to prove that his assurance is based on reality. He has the testimony of consciousness. More than that no one has a right to ask.

Yet there may be confirmatory or corroborative considerations, such as, the moral and spiritual results of the experience, the social relations of the experience, its relation to historical and objective Christianity. These have already been considered.

(6) Law of pedagogy that we learn by living. It might be well to remind ourselves here that the method of regarding religious knowledge as growing up out of religious experience is in accord with the conclusions of modern psychology and pedagogy with refernce to knowledge in other fields of investigation. The idea that knowledge about the world in which we live comes by abstract speculation about it is now pretty generally discredited. We come to know the world by living in it and observing and thinking as we live. Man is more than a thinking machine. He is a feeling, acting personality. We do not come to know the world in which we live by speculating about it, but by living. We live and learn by living. This view of the matter is accepted now by practically all schools of philosophy. It is the inductive, experimental method as opposed to the speculative, deductive method. Mr. William James has somewhere recorded it as his belief that, if God was to be known at all, it was as a matter of religious experience rather than by the method of speculation or logical deduction.

This experimental method holds in religion. The man best qualified to understand religion is the religious man. In fact, he is the only man who knows the inner reality of religion. He is the only man, therefore, who is qualified to interpret the reality of religion to others. Of course, other qualifications may help. As a matter of fact, they do. But this one is essential. If a man does not have this qualification, he may be able to discourse learnedly about religion or even reason convincingly; but he does not know at first-hand its inner reality. Hence he can not give a first-hand interpretation of God's dealings with men. Such a man may be able to set forth, with more or less of logical consistency, the teachings of the Bible. But at the very best it will be an intellectual, second-hand interpretation of what the Christian religion means. To experience fellowship with

God in Christ is the one essential condition of understanding the Christian religion.

IV. **Some observations and conclusions.** There are certain conclusions that follow concerning revelation, if it is true that God is revealed in Jesus Christ. These concern mainly the nature and function of revelation. A discussion of these will help us to a better understanding of revelation.

1. The nature of revelation. What has been said carries with it certain conclusions as to the nature of revelation.

(1) Revelation as personal.

a. By this is meant, first of all, that the medium of revelation is a person. This does not mean that God is revealed in the historic Christ alone, but that this person Jesus Christ is his final revelation. What other medium could we expect that God would use through which to reveal himself? Personality is the highest that we know. If God could not express himself through a person, the highest that we know, then he could not reveal himself at all.

b. The revelation of God through Jesus Christ a person guarantees his personality. God could impart through impersonal objects only such qualities of his being as the constitution of these things could receive and impart. To reveal his personal qualities a personal medium is necessary. To reveal his character as righteous love, a person in whose character this quality was dominant was necessary. One thing is certain: Jesus never thought of God as impersonal force or power or abstract principle. His communion was with the Father. As Father he is known to us through the communion of faith. No system of religion or philosophy that does not hold to Jesus Christ as God's final revelation to men can hold with firm grasp to the personality of God.

c. Communion with God, together with the knowledge growing out of this communion, depends upon a personal

adjustment to God as revealed in Christ. Faith is the response of a person to a person. It is the response of the whole personality, the moral nature and the will, not simply of the intellect. One may speculate about God to little avail. If one makes the proper personal adjustment, light comes.

d. Along with this is the fact that knowledge of spiritual truth is of the nature of a personal communication. In the sense of an objective, historical fact revelation was completed once for all in Christ. In the sense of a personal enlightenment to understand the truth it is an individual matter. It is concerning this latter phase of the matter that we are speaking here. Jesus says no one knows the Father except the one to whom he wills to reveal him.[1] When Peter made the great confession, Jesus told him that the Father had revealed the truth to him.[2] In one case the Son reveals the Father; in the other the Father enables Peter to know the truth about Jesus as the Messiah. In each case a knowledge of the truth was of the nature of a personal communication. Man is dependent on the will of God for a knowledge of spiritual truth. As just pointed out, the prime condition for knowing spiritual truth, therefore, is proper adjustment to that will. A passion for the will of God, a passion to know and to do his will, must possess our hearts if we would know the truth about God. Many a man gets lost in the darkness because his back is turned upon God's will for his life.

(2) Revelation put in human terms. Another thing involved in the fact that Jesus Christ is God's revelation to man is the concrete, historical human character of that revelation. Many discussions of God and his relations to man have been vitiated by the assumption that the temporal and historical order are only the shadows of the real; the real must be the eternal and the unchanging. But Christianity is based on the assumption that the his-

[1]Matt. 11: 27. [2]Matt. 16: 17.

torical is the real. This we know as a matter of experience. For a being who lives in a temporal and historical order it would seem to be true that, if the eternal is to be known, then the eternal must be reduced to temporal and historical form. This is just what took place in the case of Jesus Christ. The eternal Word became flesh and dwelt among men and they beheld his glory.[1] The eternal Word of life became visible, tangible, historically real.[2]

To put it otherwise, in Jesus Christ we have God put in human terms so that man can understand him. Through the human we reach the divine; through the temporal and the historical we reach the unchanging and the eternal. In Jesus Christ we know God.

(3) God revealed in moral terms. Ultimate reality for a moral being must be moral in its nature. The final metaphysic must be a metaphysic of conscience and of will. Moral will is the ultimate reality of the universe. When one comes to know God as revealed in Jesus Christ, he is conscious of being in fellowship with the ultimate reality of the universe. The power of Jesus over the lives of men is the power of moral goodness. He reveals God as of the same nature with himself. No sublimer words can be found than those in which it is said: "God is light," and, "God is love."[3]

(4) Revelation primarily a deed of redemption. God is revealed primarily in what he does rather than in what he says. This can be misconstrued. It is not meant that word is unimportant. In regard to Jesus, his teaching is important. But what Jesus was and did was more important than what he said. Love always expresses itself in deed primarily. God is known as a God of love in that he does something for man; he redeems him from sin.

In Old Testament revelation, we find the same thing. In relation to Israel revelation went back primarily to

[1]John 1: 1, 14. [2]1 John 1: 1, 2. [3]1 John 1: 5; 4: 8.

God's great deed of deliverance in saving Israel from Egyptian bondage. On that the covenant with Israel as a people was based. This was the foundation of Israel's obligation to be true to Jehovah. The new covenant of grace is based on a greater deed of redemption. The cross and the empty tomb of Jesus stand for this great redemptive accomplishment; and in this redemptive accomplishment we have the final disclosure of God's character as holy love.

2. The purpose of revelation. What has been said throws light on the purpose of revelation. Theology has often missed the way because it has put the emphasis at the wrong place in regard to the purpose of revelation. It has proceeded on the assumption that revelation was for the purpose of giving man a perfect intellectual understanding of the truth about God and his relations to the universe. This is a fundamental mistake. Revelation is redemptive in its end. God's purpose is the recreation of sinful and broken humanity in the moral image of God. Revealed truth is dynamic and functional in its nature. Spiritual truth has for its purpose the bringing of man into such fellowship with God as will make man like God in character, not the satisfaction of man's speculative instinct. Therefore, Dr. Mullins is right when he says that revelation gives us God, not simply truth about God.[1] It is such a self-disclosure on the part of God as enables man to come into fellowship with God.

God's purpose in revealing himself to man is not, first of all, to make theological experts, but to make the right kind of men. God gives himself to man in redemptive love. In response to this self-giving on God's part, man gives himself to God in a life of trust and love. Such a response on man's part gives a vital knowledge of God that is of the essence of religion and furnishes the material for theology.

[1] *The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression,* p. 141.

3. The finality of the Christian revelation. (1) The Christian consciousness feels perfectly assured that in Christ we have God's final revelation of himself. This was discussed somewhat in the introduction. What we have been saying also bears out this position; namely, the fact that this revelation comes through a person, gives us such communion with God as brings redemption, and brings revelation to us in moral terms. At least, for nearly two thousand years there has been no religious progress beyond this revelation of God in Christ; and nobody has yet indicated any concrete respect in which that revelation has been superseded or could be. This revelation meets man's ultimate need—redemption from sin through fellowship with God.

(2) This is not to be taken, however, to mean that Christianity is a static religion rather than a religion of progress. Christianity is a religion of progress; that is the thing that qualifies it to be the final or absolute religion. The kind of religion that mankind needs is one that has within it the possibilities of indefinite progress for mankind. Christianity meets that need. This it does by virtue of the fact that it furnishes a moral ideal that towers above man and always challenges him to ever higher attainments, while at the same time it furnishes an inexhaustible moral dynamic to enable him ever-progressively to attain to that ideal. It unshackles man from the bondage of sin and starts him on the road to upward moral and spiritual progress and never lets him rest with present attainments, but urges him forever onward and upward. It furnishes the motive and the dynamic for progress in every realm of human endeavor. But, as stated before, progress is always toward Christ, never away from nor beyond him. This is bound to be true, because he is the ideal and the dynamic of all progress.

(3) This carries with it the conclusion that Christianity is the universal religion. It is universal in the sense

that it is adapted to the needs of any and all men. Distinctions of sex, race, color or nationality do not count in the deeper matters of the spirit. A man may be a Christian because he is a man, not because he is an American, an Englishman, a German, or a Chinaman. God is no respecter of persons in the sense that he does not accept or reject a man because of social, national or family connections.

Christianity is a universal religion also in the sense that worship is not limited as to time or place. Worship is acceptable because of the attitude of mind and heart of the worshiper, not because he worships at a particular time or place or according to a prescribed form. They that worship must worship in spirit and in truth. In the New Testament we see the struggle of Christianity to break the limiting bonds of a narrow Judaism and become a universal spiritual religion. We see this especially in the teachings of Jesus and of Paul.

Why is Christianity fitted to be the universal religion? Why does it transcend the limitations of nationality and of race as well as those of time and place? Because it brings God to us in a person, Jesus Christ. Personality is the most universal thing we know. It transcends the accidents of time and place and the limits of race and nationality. In Christianity we find God in a person, not in a temple made with hands. The qualifications for meeting him are personal; that is, moral and spiritual. Hence Christianity is the universal as well as the final religion for mankind.

CHAPTER III

SUBORDINATE REVELATIONS OF GOD

I. The revelation of God to Israel.
   1. The idea of God an inheritance for Jesus.
   2. Religion of the Old Testament based on revelation.
   3. Means and methods of revelation.
      (1) Outstanding periods of revelation.
      (2) The prophets as special agents of revelation.
      (3) Israel as a whole a medium of revelation.

II. The revelation of God through nature.
   1. The fact of such revelation.
   2. Phases of this revelation.
      (1) Revelation through the physical universe.
      (2) Revelation through man.
         a. The intelligence of man in relation to the order of the world.
         b. Man as a moral being in a moral order.
         c. Man's religious nature.
   3. Formal proofs of the existence of God.
      (1) These arguments stated.
      (2) The weakness and value of the arguments.
      (3) The ontological argument.
   4. Relation of natural revelation to the revelation of God in Christ.

God's primary revelation came through Jesus Christ. This is not to be taken to mean that outside of the knowledge of the historic Christ men have no knowledge of God. On the other hand, the idea of a God or gods is a practically universal possession of the race. God has revealed himself in divers portions and manners to the whole race of mankind. It is these subordinate and

preparatory revelations of God that we wish to consider now, together with the relation of these to the revelation of God in Christ.

I. **The revelation of God to Israel.** We consider this first because the revelation of God in Christ is most directly related to it.

1. The idea of God an inheritance for Jesus. The idea of God was an inheritance on the part of Jesus from Old Testament religion and from the Judaism of his day. This idea did not come to Jesus *de novo*, as a thing without historical relations or antecedents. Old Testament religion prepared the way for New Testament religion; Judaism blazed the path for Christianity. Christianity was not an absolute break with the past. This idea of God that Jesus inherited he accepted, expanded and completed, just as he did Old Testament religion as a whole. There is nothing that distinguishes the religion of the Old Testament so much from other pre-Christian religions as its conception of God. He is always thought of as personal, ethical, absolute in power and wisdom, a God of gracious purpose concerning Israel and, at times, concerning the other nations. He stood in peculiar relation to Israel because of his covenant with Israel, based on his redemption of his people from Egypt. Israel and God belonged to each other in covenant relation. Yet the other nations were responsible to him and he chastised them for their sins.

2. Religion of the Old Testament based on revelation. According to the unanimous voice of Old Testament writers this idea of God came to Israel by means of revelation. Revelation is the foundation of Old Testament religion. As in the New Testament, this revelation is the coming of God himself into the life of the people rather than the communication of a doctrine about God. One might say that the Old Testament is the record of the progressive impartation of the life of God to Israel, and (ideally at least) through Israel to the world. No

Old Testament writer or speaker ever thought of questioning God's power to communicate with man or man's ability to receive a revelation from God. The prophets always came saying: "Thus saith the Lord." Their message they claimed to receive from God and impart to the people. They knew also the distinction between true and false prophets. Not every man who claimed to speak in Jehovah's name was regarded as having Jehovah's message. Moreover, the power to receive God's message was not confined to Israel. Job is an example of a non-Israelite to whom God revealed himself. Besides there is a line of witnesses before Abraham, going back to Adam, testifying to the fact that God was keeping in touch with men. One of the values of the early chapters of Genesis lies in this testimony that from the first man was not left alone, but that from the dawn of human existence God has revealed himself to man.

3. Means and methods of revelation. God used various means and methods for revealing himself to his people. Sometimes by dream, as in the case of Jacob,[1] sometimes by vision, as in the case of the prophets Ezekiel and Amos,[2] sometimes perhaps by audible voice, as in the case of the child Samuel,[3] by various means and measures God spoke to his people. A legitimate distinction might be made between God's revelation of his will for guidance in particular situations, either in the case of individuals, or larger groups, or even the nation, and such a disclosure of himself as constituted an advance knowledge of God for Israel and through Israel for the race. It is in the latter sense mainly that we are here interested in the matter. Considering the matter in this sense, the following things need attention:

(1) There were several outstanding periods of God's revelation to Israel. We might name as such periods the call and commission of Abraham, in which God en-

[1]Gen. 28: 12.
[2]Ezek. 1: 1ff; Amos 1: 1; 8:1, 2.
[3]1 Sam. 3: 1ff.

tered into covenant relations with Abraham's descendants, promising to bless them and make them a blessing to the world; the deliverance from Egypt under the leadership of Moses, the formation of the national covenant on the basis of this deliverance, and the giving of the law; the time of Samuel, in which the schools of the prophets were established and the monarchy founded; and the time of the later prophets during the decline of the national life, the captivity and restoration. This does not mean that there was no voice from God between these periods, but it does mean that these were outstanding periods of revelation. It will be noticed also that, with the exception of the first, each of these periods of revelation was connected with a crisis in the national life. This shows that revelation, in the history of Israel as with Jesus, was not so much in teaching about God as the impartation of the life of God to meet the needs of his people. It was in these great crises that God gave himself in a new way to meet the needs of his people and in furtherance of his redemptive purpose for Israel and for the world.

(2) God's special agents in revealing himself to Israel were the prophets. These were not an official class. The official class was the priests. These contributed comparatively little to the spiritual uplift and advancement of the nation. The prophets were individuals with a special sense of a call and a mission from Jehovah. They were men who had the consciousness of a message from God to the people of their day. Their message was one of condemnation for the sins and godlessness of the people and yet their message was one of grace and hope. These prophets were usually men from the ranks of the common people, who lived an upright life and faithfully proclaimed God's message to the people, regardless of consequences to themselves. Their messages will be of permanent spiritual power and blessing for mankind.

(3) The nation of Israel as a whole was the organ or medium of God's revelation to the world. He entered into a covenant with the nation; he had a purpose for the nation. This covenant purpose was realized in spite of the fact that the nation was finally rejected. The nation had the consciousness of a peculiar relation to Jehovah. Israel was Jehovah's people, not to the exclusion of others, but looking ultimately to the inclusion of the Gentile nations. This purpose of making Israel God's missionary to the nations was realized through the coming of Christ and the establishment of his universal religion, although the purpose was realized in spite of Israel's disobedience and her national pride and exclusiveness. It was accomplished by virtue of the fact that the life of Israel as a whole was prophetic and prepared the way for his coming who is the desire of all nations and in whom we have God's final revelation of himself to the nations.

II. **The revelation of God through nature.**

1. The fact of such revelation. That God is revealed through nature we have abundant evidence. This revelation is recognized in both the Old and New Testaments. Nature bears witness to God. The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork.[1] Jesus speaks of nature in such a way as to bear witness that he recognizes nature as the work of God and as the means by which man comes into conscious contact with God.[2] Paul says that the invisible things of God, even his everlasting power and divinity, are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made.[3] Moreover, the universal consciousness of God bears testimony to the fact that he is somehow making himself known to man. The consciousness of man is a religious consciousness. It is religious by virtue of the fact that it is human. A human consciousness that is not religious

[1]Ps. 19: 1. [2]See Matt. 6: 25ff. [3]Rom. 1: 20.

is not normal. The consciousness of God and of self are practically inseparable, particularly the consciousness of self as transcending the material order and as moral. Supernatural or special revelation presupposes natural or universal revelation. Man's natural consciousness as religious is the basis of supernatural religion.

2. Phases of this revelation. This revelation of God might be regarded as having within it certain phases according to the medium of the revelation or the phase of nature through which God is revealing himself.

(1) The revelation through the physical universe. The lowest phase of this revelation is the revelation of God through the physical universe. This is the phase of it that Paul seems to have in mind when he says that God's eternal power and divinity are clearly seen through the things that are made, and is clearly what the psalmist has in mind when he says that the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament shows his handiwork. The existence of the universe with its beauty and order impresses us with the wisdom and the power of God.

(2) The revelation through man. The highest and most impressive phase of this revelation of God, however, is that which comes through human life. God reveals himself to man through his own rational, moral and religious nature. God is limited in revealing himself by the medium through which he reveals himself. Hence, while we may know something of God's majesty, wisdom and power as he reveals himself through the physical universe, in order to know God as a personal intelligence and righteousness, we must see him as revealed through a personal medium, man. We consider man, however, in relation to his environment. This gives us the evidence for God's existence from man and the world in which he lives. There are two or three

phases of this revelation of God through man that are very impressive. Let us consider these.

a. The intelligence of man in relation to the order of the world. It is an impressive fact that man can interpret the world in which he lives. In all his investigations of the world in which he lives, he proceeds on the assumption, consciously or unconsciously, that the world in which he lives is a world of law and order. In the results of his investigations, he justifies this assumption. He finds that the world in which he lives is knowable. This could not be true unless it were a world of order. Man finds in the world around him such laws, such orderly processes, such casual connections among phenomena, that he reduces one realm of life after another to scientific knowledge.

The question arises: How is it that nature responds to intelligence in man? How shall we explain the fact that man as an intelligent being can interpret the world in which he lives? It is plausibly argued by many modern writers that the world could not thus be interpreted by intelligence unless it had originated with intelligence. Only that which originates with intelligence and expresses intelligence can be interpreted by intelligence. So it is argued that the fact that the world can be interpreted by intelligence is evidence that the world originated with and expresses intelligence. A man picks up a piece of paper on which a chicken has walked with muddy feet and left marks. The man can get no meaning out of these marks because there was none put into them. The same man digs into the earth and finds an old manuscript, buried for centuries, with marks that do not appear to express any more meaning than the marks left by the hen. But on closer examination the old manuscript is made to yield treasures of knowledge. In one case man gets meaning out of the marks because intelligence put meaning into them; in the other case he gets none because none was put into them. How can

man get meaning out of the world? Because an intelligent Being put meaning into it. Man does not impress upon the world the law and order that he finds there; he finds them. They were put there by Another. The most reasonable explanation of man's intelligence in relation to a world of law and order is that both originated with a creative Mind and that this creative Mind is the bond of union between the two. This is the only reasonable explanation of man as a rational being and of his power rationally to interpret the world. Rationality in man or in his world could not originate with the sub-rational. The rational order of the world and the rational nature of man testify to the presence of an intelligent God in the world.

b. Man as a moral being in a moral order. Man is not only a rational being in a rational world; he is also a moral being in a moral world. As the former fact indicates that man and his world originated with a creative mind, so the latter fact indicates that man and his world originated with a moral being. Man intuitively feels that there is a distinction between right and wrong and that he is obligated to do the right and avoid doing the wrong. In other words, his moral consciousness testifies that he is under moral law. This moral consciousness is of the nature of a "categorical imperative"; that is, it puts the subject under absolute obligation to obey its behests; it admits of no excuses or exceptions. The fact that man is under moral law carries with it the idea that he lives in a moral world. He has moral relations. To disregard these moral relations, to defy the demands of the moral law, carries with it certain evil consequences, brings upon the sinner certain evil results. On the other hand, to obey the moral law, to live as one's moral relations demand, brings certain good results.

What makes the world a moral order? How does it come about that man is under moral law? Theism ex-

plains the moral order by referring it to God. It says that God is a moral being, righteous in his nature, who demands righteousness of man. He made man with the capacity to know and do the right. Man's moral consciousness is a revelation of God's demand that man be righteous. In instituting a moral order God made it so that righteousness brings its own reward and sin its own punishment. Man's moral nature, together with the moral order that it implies, testifies to the presence of a God of righteousness in the world.

c. Man's religious nature. Man is more than a rational and moral being; he is a religious being. He longs for communion with the unseen and spiritual world. Fellowship with the visible and human order does not satisfy him. Man is "incurably religious." He may be irreligious; he can hardly be non-religious. Religion is not a thing toward which he can be neutral or with reference to which he can be indifferent. There is in man's heart an ineradicable thirst for God.

Whatever else may be said about religion, it is one of the most powerful factors in human life. It influences the whole of life. It has been one of the most potent factors in building or destroying great civilizations, in the rise and fall of nations. It does more than any other factor in elevating or degrading life.

How shall we account for man's religious nature, his persistent thirst for God and the power of religion in human life? What are the source and cause of man's idea of God? Is it only a superstition? How is it that man persistently and universally longs for the spiritual? Man's rational nature presupposes a rational world and truth objective to man. There could be no rational life except in a rational environment. Man's moral nature presupposes a moral world. There are moral relations that man did not make but which he must regard. There is an objective moral law. There could be no moral life if there were no moral order in the world obective to

man. Does not man's consciousness of God presuppose a God objective to man as his rational consciousness presupposes truth and his moral consciousness presupposes moral law? Shall we believe that man's rational consciousness and his moral consciousness are valid, but that his religious consciousness is an illusion?

It is difficult to see how we are going to hold that man's consciousness gives him truth at all, if we are going to hold that his religious consciousness cannot be trusted in its fundamental affirmation of the existence of supersensible reality. If there is no God, then it seems that man is forever doomed by his very constitution to believe in and search for a God that he can never find. If there is no God, what power is it that has kept alive in man's heart through the millenniums of human history the belief in a God or gods?

So man's religious nature, as well as his rational and moral nature, testifies to the existence of God and his immanence in human life. On the assumption that there is a God who instituted the world as a rational and moral order and placed man in it as a part of that order, with the capacity not only to interpret the world in which he lives and to live in accordance with the demands of the moral law, but also with the capacity to know the God who made him and sustains his existence—on this assumption human life has, to be sure, many complexities and difficult problems, but is not hopeless either from the rational, moral or religious point of view; but on the opposite assumption it is an insoluble enigma any way we consider it.

3. Formal proofs of the existence of God. The evidences for the theistic view which we have been considering have often been presented by theologians in the form of "proofs" for God's existence. These proofs were once looked upon by the advocates of theism as being convincing, if not rationally compelling, arguments.

(1) These arguments stated. Three or four distinct proofs were presented. One was the cosmological. This was an argument to prove the existence of God from the fact of the existence of the cosmos or world. It was argued that there was no way to account for the origin of the world except to refer it to a creative act of God's will. The effort was to find a first cause, and, since material forces do not seem to have originative power, it was held that the power that originated the world must be of the nature of a personal will. Another argument was the teleological. This was an argument to prove the existence of God from the evidences of design or purpose in the world. The existence of order in the world was held to be proof that the world originated with an intelligent being. Chance could not account for the presence of law and order in the world, it was held. There was also the anthropological argument; that is, the argument for God's existence from man's rational and moral nature. It was said that only a righteous personality could produce a personal being such as man with the power to distinguish right from wrong and the sense of moral obligation.

These three arguments, it will readily be seen, are not three different arguments; they are only three different aspects of the same argument. Underlying each argument is the principle of causality—that every effect must have a cause. In the first case, the supposed effect to be accounted for is the existence of the physical universe; in the second, it is the existence of law and order in the world; in the third, it is the existence of man as a moral and personal being. In each case, an adequate explanation of the phenomenon regarded as an effect, or a thing produced, was sought.

(2) The weakness and value of the arguments. These arguments do not carry the weight that they once did in philosophical and theological circles. This is due to two things. One is that these arguments have been

strongly attacked and their weaknesses pointed out. The other is a decided change in emphasis in recent thought in which comparatively little emphasis is placed on formal demonstration or logical deduction, and more emphasis given to experience and the inductive method. Some have considered that the modern theory of evolution had taken all the force out of the teleological argument on the ground that particular instances of organs adapted to useful ends did not seem to be specifically designed, but rather developed under the operation of certain natural forces. But theists have generally said in answer to this that the fact that a certain organ came as the result of a process of development did not prove that the organ was not intended, but rather it tended to show that the process itself was directed toward a useful end. Some have held that on a broader view the evolutionary hypothesis strengthened this argument, since it indicated that there was a superintending intelligence directing the whole world order to higher ends.

The moral phase of the anthropological argument has commanded more respect that any other of these arguments since the days of Immanuel Kant.

Now, what about the validity of these arguments? Have they any value? As indications that the world is spiritual in origin and significance undoubtedly they have. What we said above about nature and man as a revelation of God was one way of stating these arguments. But as formal "proofs" of God's existence, they are at least of doubtful value.

Can we "prove" the existence of God? That depends upon what you mean by "prove." If you mean that such arguments can be given as to infallibly convince any one, no matter what his inclinations or prepossessions, that there is a God, then surely we can not "prove" the existence of God. In a question like this perhaps as much depends upon the prepossessions and attitude of mind of the one to be convinced as upon the cogency of the

arguments presented. There are no arguments that will convince a man who does not want to believe in God. In the moral and religious realms our beliefs are more a matter of personal inclination and choice than we often think they are. Whether or not we believe in God depends largely on whether or not we want to believe in him. In the moral and religious realm there is no such thing as "pure reason," that is, reason acting without reference to personal interest, feeling, and choice. The only reason we know is human reason, and man is a feeling, acting being as well as a thinking being.

It is well that the element of preference, inclination and choice enters into our belief in God. Otherwise there would be no element of freedom, and hence of personal responsibility, with reference to our belief in God. If such arguments for God's existence could be presented that we were compelled, whether or no, to accept the existence of God, the element of freedom would be gone. There are some realms in which the acceptance or non-acceptance of truth is a matter primarily, if not exclusively, of one's intellectual ability to see and understand. This is true in the realm of mathematics and physical science, but in the realm of morals and religion the feelings and the will have much to do with our ability to see and understand the truth.

One can not "prove" the existence of God, then, in the sense of setting forth arguments which will compel assent. One can not give arguments for the existence of God which are so convincing that for one not to accept the conclusion would be an indication on his part of mental weakness or deficiency.

On the other hand, if you mean by "proving" the existence of God that one should give good reasons why he believes in God, then one can prove the existence of God. Is the belief in God a belief that is rationally justifiable? Yes. If not, then we have no right to believe in God. No man has a right to accept any belief for which

there is no rational justification. If our belief in God can not be rationally justified, then we should give it up. Furthermore, it should be said that these arguments for the existence of God have been of less use by far in convincing men who did not accept the idea of God than they have in justifying the faith of those who already believed in him. They were arguments by which men of a philosophical age justified to themselves their belief in God against the attacks of those who did not accept that belief. They have not had much use in convincing unbelievers.

This method comes down to us from an age when it was thought that the way to establish truth was by the process of the formal Aristotelian logic. But modern psychology and pedagogy have showed us that knowledge does not come that way. Nor is it confirmed that way. Most of what we believe we do not believe because it has been proved to us. And what has been proved to us has not been proved by the processes of formal logic. We now understand that our abstract logical processes cut a very small figure in our acquisition of knowledge. Knowledge rather grows up in and out of our life processes. Our knowledge is the means by which we interpret life to ourselves and by which we guide ourselves in further life activities. So it is in religion as in other things.

This argument can not be considered a logical demonstration that God exists. No such argument for God's existence can be given. Nor is the argument free from difficulties and objections. But neither of these facts should be considered as invalidating the argument. The fairer way to put the question would be to ask what is the best explanation of the universe as we know it, the one freest from objections and difficulties. In considering the different explanations that are given they can in the last analysis be reduced to either the theistic, here advocated, or the materialistic. Of course, there is the

agnostic position, which is not an explanation, but rather a denial that any explanation can be given. But the only real attempts to explain the universe are the one which refers it to mechanical and impersonal forces and the one which refers it to personality. To refer the universe to impersonal forces, amounts in effect to materialism, whatever name may be given the theory. On the other hand, to refer the universe to a personal cause, is theism. As between the two it ought not to be difficult to choose.

(3) The ontological argument. This argument is different in kind from those already considered. They were arguments in which God was inferred as the cause of certain supposed effects which we know. We reasoned from effects back to a cause and God was inferred as the cause. This is an argument in which the existence of God is inferred on the ground that certain abstract and necessary ideas of the mind involve the thought of his existence. In other words, certain necessary ideas of the mind, when analyzed, are found to contain as a constituent element the thought of God's existence. It is, therefore, inferred that there is a God who corresponds to this thought of him.

In one form the argument may be stated as follows: Man has the idea of a perfect being. But the idea of existence is necessary to the idea of perfection. That is, if a being were thought of as not existing, he would not be thought of as perfect. The idea of perfection involves the idea of existence.

It has been said in answer to this argument that the idea of a perfect being does not carry with it the conclusion that such a being exists in fact. Even if the idea of perfection carries with it the idea of existence, this would be existence in thought only, not existence in fact. This argument, it is said, shows what is contained in the idea of God, not that God exists.

But is there not more in this argument than this objection allows? The validity of the argument depends on

two things. The first is the principle that a necessary idea of the mind must be assumed to be objectively valid. By a necessary idea is meant one that inevitably comes to consciousness as the mind develops in its reactions with the world in which it lives. As the mind becomes reflective, as it becomes more and more conscious of itself and the laws according to which it operates, there are certain ideas that come into consciousness. We find when we become conscious of these ideas or principles that unconsciously our minds have been operating in accordance with them before we become conscious of them. In some minds they never come into consciousness. They may be called laws of thought. Such an idea is the principle of causality, that every effect must have a cause. It must be assumed that these necessary ideas of the mind, these ideas that come into consciousness as the mind becomes self-conscious and reflective, are true or objectively valid. In other words, it must be assumed that the objective world corresponds to these necessary ideas. Otherwise our minds are so made that we are compelled to think so as to give us falsehood rather than truth. If my mind is so constructed that it operates according to certain laws, so that certain ideas necessarily develop in my thinking as my mind develops, but there is no objective reality corresponding to my ideas, then I am forever doomed not to know the truth. Rationality, then, becomes irrationality. I can assume such a maladjustment between my mind and the world, but such an assumption will not work. Such an assumption means that mind must commit suicide. On the other hand, I may not be able to prove that the laws according to which my mind operates are valid. I have nothing to which I can appeal except my mind, and to appeal to that is to assume the very thing that I am seeking to prove. In fact, I must assume it to think at all. I must assume it even to deny it. If I assume that these laws of thought

or necessary ideas are true and proceed with the activities of my mind in relation to the world, I find that it works. It stands the pragmatic test. The opposite assumption does not work. It lands me in hopeless and complete agnosticism.

The other thing on which the validity of this argument would depend is to show that the idea of a perfect being is a necessary idea of the mind. If the necessary ideas of the mind must be assumed to be true and the idea of a perfect being is a necessary idea of the mind, then this idea must be accepted as true or objectively valid. As pointed out above, this would not be proof of the existence of God in the sense of mathematical or scientific demonstration, but it would be putting our belief in God on such a basis as would make the opposite assumption a fundamentally irrational one.

Is, then, the belief in a perfect being a necessary idea of the mind? Is it an idea that necessarily emerges in the development of rationality? Consider the following facts: Man's sense of dependence and helplessness would seem to imply an absolute, self-existent being on whom he depends. Man's ideas of the beautiful, the true and the good would seem to imply the existence somewhere in the universe of an absolute or perfect standard of beauty, truth and goodness. Otherwise, could there be any beauty, truth or goodness? Do not relative values of beauty, truth and goodness imply an absolute standard? If so, then it is difficult to see how these standards could exist except in a being of absolute or perfect beauty, truth and goodness. So we believe that the idea of a perfect being is so related to human experience and thought that the idea operates as an unconscious assumption in the operations of the mind, and when the mind becomes reflective this idea necessarily emerges.

Consequently we believe there is more in the ontological argument for the existence of God than is usally allowed. Yet the argument is so highly abstract and dif-

ficult to follow that to the ordinary mind it makes little appeal. Perhaps its main value has been to help clarify the content of the idea of God.

4. Relation of natural revelation to the revelation of God in Christ. Another question needs some consideration here. What is the relation of the revelation of God in Christ to other revelations of God? Or, to put it another way, what is the relation of the truth as we know it in Christianity to religious truth as obtained from other sources? Another phase of the same question is: What is the relation of Christianity to other religions?

Undoubtedly there are other and subordinate revelations of God. Doubtless the revelation of God in Christ would be impossible except for other preparatory revelations. God is revealed in the physical world. He is also revealed in man's rational and moral nature. The course of human history is a disclosure of God's dealings with men if one has the spiritual discernment to see his hand in history.

But the knowledge of God thus derived is partial, fragmentary, incomplete. The Christian revelation may be looked upon as the fulfilment or completion of these others. The Christian revelation is not to be regarded as detached and unrelated to the knowledge of God otherwise obtained. It is not supernatural in the sense that it is unrelated to nature, its forces and processes. Above all, it is not contra-natural. It is rather the fulfilment of nature. Although there is a revelation of God in nature, that revelation is not sufficient to meet the needs of man's religious nature and without the revelation of God in Christ man is left forever groping in the dark.

The same thing may be said with reference to human nature, especially with reference to the religious aspect of human nature. God is revealed in man's rational, moral and religious nature. There is in the human soul an ineradicable thirst for God. God has planted eternity

in the heart of man. God has so made man that he can not rest till he rests in God.

So we may find out something about God if we study man, and particularly if we study his religious life. Man's religous life could be studied from the standpoint of the religious consciousness which gives us the psychology of religion; or from the standpoint of the history of man's religious life; or with reference to the actual religions in comparative religion. But none of these, nor all of them, would give us a satisfactory knowledge of God. Yet they do give us some truth about God; and especially when viewed in relation to the Christian revelation as partial and preparatory revelations of God, they are valuable means of the knowledge of God. Only when we come to the knowledge of God in Christ do we find a knowledge that satisfies the religious consciousness and meets the needs of man's religious life.

Another thing to be remembered is that much of the light of God that we see in nature, history and man's natural religious consciousness we see because we have seen God in Christ. With our spiritual eyes opened and our hearts purified by faith in Christ, we are better prepared to discern the presence and working of God in these other realms. In fact, when we come to study the person of Christ, we may come to see that these other broken lights are, after all, the light of Christ.

What was said about the knowledge of God given in man's religious consciousness suggests another question: What is the relation of the Christian religion to other religions? Are other religions true or false? Are they of God or of the devil? Are they a blessing or a curse to their adherents?

It would be difficult to give a categorical answer to any one of these questions. These religions are partly true and partly false. They might be considered from God in the sense that they are an expression of man's religious nature. They may in some respects have exer-

cised a beneficent influence over their adherents in keeping alive the consciousness of God. They may, in some respects at least, have prevented man from sinking as deep in degradation as otherwise he would and even have lifted him to a higher moral and social plane. But to say this is by no means to say that the superstition, falsehood and perversions of man's religious nature are of God. Man's religious nature has been darkened and perverted by sin.

These statements might be made clearer by a concrete example. Take Mohammedanism. There are elements of truth in Mohammedanism. Its doctrine of one supreme God is true. But on the other hand its conception of God as absolute and arbitrary power is a perverted conception of God, therefore untrue. Again, when Mohammed came as a fiery messenger announcing the doctrine of only one God and thereby welded the scattered idolatrous tribes of Arabia into a whole, he lifted them to a higher plane. But they soon reached the limit of the moral and intellectual heights to which Mohammedanism could furnish the motive power to lift them and their development was arrested. In contrast with this, Christianity furnishes an ideal and motive power for indefinite moral and spiritual development. Its power of moral incentive and spiritual inspiration has never been exhausted and the Christian confidently believes from his experience of fellowship with God in Christ that it never will be.

Christianity contains all the truth that any one of these religions contains and more. In its true form it contains none of their superstitions and falsehoods. They find, then, their fulfilment in it. The truths they contain are but broken lights of Christ. They represent man's gropings in the dark after God; Christianity represents God's finding of man in Christ.

CHAPTER IV.

THEORIES THAT DENY THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

I. Materialism.

1. The view stated.
2. Present standing of materialism.
3. Objections to materialism.
   (1) Ignores personality.
   (2) Fails in view of freedom.
   (3) Takes significance out of moral life.
   (4) Undermines religion.

II. Pantheism.

1. The view stated.
2. Pantheism refuted.
   (1) Denies testimony of self-consciousness.
   (2) Fails in effort to think of God in non-human terms
   (3) Undermines moral ideas and ideals.
   (4) Fails to satisfy man's religious needs.

III. Agnosticism.

1. What it is.
2. An appraisal and criticism.
   (1) Our knowledge recognized as partial.
   (2) Inconsistencies of agnosticism.
   (3) False conception of the infinite.
   (4) Failure in religion.

IV. Anti-Christian Theism.

1. What the view holds.
2. The view criticised.
   (1) True emphasis on personality.
   (2) Failure to evaluate Jesus.

The Christian view holds that the fundamental reality of the universe is a personal Spirit who has given a revelation of himself to man in various ways, supremely in Jesus Christ. He has given a limited revelation of himself in impersonal nature and in man as a rational and moral being. This general revelation, however, does not meet the spiritual needs of man, particularly his greatest need of redemption from sin. In response to man's need, God has given a special revelation of himself through the nation of Israel and her chosen prophets. This revelation comes to its culmination and finality in Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Savior of the world.

There are certain views of the world and of life, however, that deny in toto the Christian doctrine of revelation. It might be worthy of notice that all attacks on Christianity that amount to much are based on certain philosophical presuppositions or principles that negative the underlying principles of Christianity. Hence we will now notice briefly some of these general world views that deny the Christian view of revelation.

I. **Materialism.** Beginning on what might be called the lowest plane, the first view that needs attention is materialism.

1. The view stated. Materialism is the most direct and emphatic denial of the possibility of any revelation from God. It says that man can not know God for the simple reason that there is no God to know. In general, materialism denies the spiritual aspect of life. It says that everything is matter or some phase or product of matter. Mind is only one aspect of physical energy. Materialism makes much of the law of the transformation of energy. Mind is only physical energy transformed. Human personality is only a temporary phase of reality. There is no freedom. The idea of freedom is only an illusion. Since everything must come under the law of the transformation of energy, there can be no

new beginning. Everything is predetermined. Everything is the outcome under the law of the transformation of energy of forces previously operative. And if one had knowledge enough to see and estimate rightly all the forces now at work, he could tell with exact precision what the results would be.

2. Present standing of materialism. As a recognized philosophy, thoroughgoing materialism does not have much standing to-day. In the realm of philosophy it has been pretty generally refuted and repudiated. But as a tendency and a dominating influence in the realm of science, it holds large sway. In so-called scientific circles, to hold to anything like freedom would make science impossible, it is said. To allow freedom would be to introduce an element of uncertainty that would upset all our scientific calculations and that can not be allowed. Unless the world is uniform, how can you tell what effect a certain cause will produce?

3. Objections to materialism. The general objection to materialism is that it takes account of only a part of the facts of life. The materialist simplifies his view of life by ignoring the most important aspects of life. There are several specifications that may be made under this general objection.

(1) In order to interpret life in terms of matter, this view ignores mind, spirit, personality; at least it fails to give any sufficient explanation of these. In fact materialism fails to explain life of any kind, much less human and personal life. Non-living forces can not produce life. Personal life cannot be interpreted in terms of matter or of force. We know ourselves as abiding realities over against the world of change. "The one inescapable thing is personality." Personality is as real as matter. Man knows himself and other persons just as really as he knows material forces; will power is as real as these.

Matter cannot produce mind, for mind is greater than matter. Man is greater than nature. Human history is more than the record of the dance of atoms.

(2) So far as the objection to personal freedom in the name of science is concerned, we must remember that freedom is not synonymous with lawlessness. But there are forms of law and order other than the law and order represented by material force and the law of the transformation of energy. The human will is just as truly a causal power as material force, to say the least. There are other sciences than those in which the law of the transformation of energy is operative. Some sciences deal with human life and personal relations.

The very existence of science is a tribute to mind. Sciences do not construct themselves. Flowers do not organize themselves into botanies. Matter does not produce the science of physics and chemistry.

(3) Materialism takes all the significance out of man's moral life. On the basis of a materialistic philosophy the distinction between right and wrong has no meaning. Where there is no freedom such an idea as "ought" is a misnomer. Everything takes place under the law of necessity and one thing is as right as another, though it may not be as pleasant.

(4) According to materialism, religion is only a superstition. There is no place for religion because there is no God to worship. Death is the end of all. This life alone is man's concern.

Surely there is something radically wrong with a view that so perverts man's fundamental intuitions as to convert religion into a superstition, undermine the distinction between right and wrong, and make freedom an illusion and human personality only a temporary product of material forces.

II. **Pantheism.**

1. The view stated. Another world view that denies the Christian view of revelation is pantheism. It neces-

sarily denies the Christian view of revelation since it denies that there is any personal God to reveal himself. Pantheism identifies God and the world in such a way that they can not be distinguished. According to this view, God is not a personal being with self-consciousness and self-determination such as we are. To think of God thus is to make God only a magnified man; this is unjustifiable anthropomorphism—attributing human qualities and modes of being to God. This way of thinking of God, so pantheism holds, gives us a limited God—takes away his infinity and perfection. Instead of this we must think of God as rising above such limitations.

He is, therefore, not a personal being with a limited self-consciousness that distinguishes him from the world and hence separates him from it; he is rather the impersonal intelligence and life that pervades the whole universe. God and nature are one. God is so identified with the forces and processes of nature that man can not know any God apart from nature. Nature is looked upon as being simply the outer aspect or manifestation of God, God being the soul of the universe. Pantheism does not professedly deny that we can know God, but it does deny that we can know any God apart from the processes of nature, for it denies that there is any such God. God and nature are not related as Creator and creation, as Maker and product; they are related as inner and outer aspects of the same reality. Nature is simply a passing phase or manifestation of the Infinite Reality which we call God. God lives only in and through nature. Therefore there is no personal God who transcends nature. Hence man as a personal being only rises for a moment to the surface of the great ocean of being and then is lost again in that ocean. Man's personality does not abide. Hence there is no immortality. Man's true destiny is to be swallowed up in the Infinite. Man's consciousness of separateness from nature is illusory.

It is easy to see, then, that pantheism denies that there is any special incarnation of God in a human life. God is rather incarnated in humanity as a whole; he indwells the whole universe. Jesus was divine, but only in the sense that all men are.

2. Pantheism refuted. In refutation of the pantheistic view consider the following facts:

(1) Pantheism denies the testimony of our self-consciousness. Our self-consciousness testifies to our distinction from nature on the one hand, and from God on the other.[1] Any philosophy that identifies man with God contradicts this fundamental posit of consciousness. This feeling of distinctness is so fundamental in our consciousness that, if we can not accept it as trustworthy, it is difficult to see how we can trust our consciousness at all.

(2) The effort to conceive of God in other than human terms is a mistake. In thinking of God we must think of him in terms of human experience. We must always go from the known to the unknown. In thinking of the spiritual we usually do so in figures of speech taken from the material realm. In thinking of God we must think of him in terms of personality or in terms of the sub-personal. There are no other terms in which man can think of God. Human life, animal life and material force seem to exhaust the possible terms in which we may think of God. Shall we think of him in terms of the highest we know, man's moral and rational life; or shall we think of him in terms of the lower, animal life or material force? Pantheism says that the fault of Christianity is that it thinks of God in human terms. Christianity admits the charge that it thinks of God in human terms, but maintains that its excellence consists in the fact that it has God revealed through the medium of a perfect human life, the life of Jesus. Of course there is always the danger of thinking of God

[1] Cf. Strong, "Systematic Theology," Vol. I, p. 102.

in terms of the limitations or imperfections of human life rather than in terms of human life at its highest and best. But it seems that we must think of God in terms of human life; or else in terms of the sub-personal which degrades our conception of him; or in such abstract generalities as to take all reality out of our thought of him.

(3) Pantheism undermines moral ideas and ideals about as effectively as does materialism. If man is a phase of the life of the Infinite, or an element in that life, then it would seem that man's sin and error belong to God as well as his holiness and right thinking. Besides, there is no such thing with God as self-directed thought or activity, no such thing as moral purpose. All his thought and activity are of the nature of a necessitated process. Moreover, man's freedom is lost in this necessitated process of the infinite life, the all. Where is there any ground for moral distinctions or for moral life in such a scheme?

(4) Pantheism is not much more successful in providing for man's religious life than it is for his moral life. The heart of religion is man's relation as a person to God as a person. Pantheism, therefore, takes the heart out of religion. Prayer becomes a form of meditation. Worship becomes an attitude of reverence and awe toward the Universe or the Infinite. No provision is made for man's consciousness of sin and guilt.

It is evident that in its practical issues there is very little difference between pantheism and materialism. The main difference is in the name. One writes over the door of the universe: God is all. The other writes: There is no God. But if nature is the only reality, what difference does it make whether you call it matter or God? You may call it God; but if God does not transcend nature, then nature is the only God you have. If God does nothing more than the natural order does, then it does not help the situation to call the natural order

God. The great question is not what we find inscribed over the temple of the universe, but what we find upon entering that temple. If God can not manifest himself except in and through the laws and operations of nature, then after all nature is the only reality, and calling it God, even having feelings of reverence and awe toward it, does not make nature a God. So while pantheism does not tell you straight out, as materialism does, that there is no God to know, when it gets through telling you what God is, you discover that there is no God except in name.

III. **Agnosticism.**

1. What is agnosticism? Agnosticism is more difficult to define than either materialism or pantheism. This is due to the fact that it is not a definite philosophy with reference to the nature of reality and the structure of the world, but rather a general attitude of mind that denies that we can ever have such a philosophy. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it is a theory of knowledge that denies that we can have any definite system of metaphysics. The main philosophical influence in modern agnosticism is the philosophy of Immanuel Kant. He held that we can know phenomena but not noumena; that, is, we may know appearances, but not the reality underlying the appearances, or, as he expressed it, the thing-in-itself. The phenomenal is that which appears to man through his senses; the noumenal is that which lies back of the phenomenal and is its ground and support. Agnosticism says that the phenomenal is all that man can really know. It does not usually deny that there is any reality back of the phenomenal, but it says that what the nature of that reality is we can not know. It sometimes goes so far as to affirm (or at least to assume) that there is such a reality and that it is infinite, and that because it is infinite and man is finite it, therefore, can not be known by man. The finite can not grasp the infinite.

The agnostic idea with reference to the religious realm is very well summed up in the saying, often heard, that with reference to spiritual matters we can not know, we can only believe or have faith. Agnosticism does not deny, as materialism does, that there is a God, but it denies that man can know God if he does exist.

2. An appraisal and criticism of agnosticism.

(1) There is much in this general attitude with which one can sympathize. We can readily agree that there are very decided limitations on our power to know, at least in our present form of existence. There would not be much use to discuss the question with one who would not grant that. We would also readily agree that our knowledge of God is limited, because a finite being could not know completely the Infinite One. No doubt, one thing that has contributed to the agnostic attitude in theology has been the claims of theology to know more than can be known. Oftentimes there has been wearisome and barren speculation over questions that were largely of speculative interest only. These wearisome debates have led to an agnostic reaction against theology.

(2) There seem to be some fundamental inconsistencies in agnosticism. Is it consistent with its own assumptions when it talks about a "thing-in-itself" back of its appearances and different from them? If the reality is so utterly unlike its manifestations that it can not be known through them, then how does the agnostic know that there is such a reality? Especially does the agnostic seem to know a good deal when he talks about this unknowable reality as infinite. If it is unknowable, how did the agnostic discover that it was infinite?

Agnosticism is not consistent in setting phenomena and noumena, or appearances and the reality back of the appearances, over against each other, as though man could know phenomena or appearances and not

know the reality back of the appearances. To speak of manifestations in which nothing is manifested, or appearances in which nothing appears, is to talk absurdities. A truer principle would be that in and through phenomena we do know reality. What reason is there for assuming that the reality, or thing in itself, is so different from its manifestations, and so utterly unlike its appearances, that it can not be known through its appearances? At least to assume that we know the thing in and through its qualities enables us to make our practical adjustments in relation to the thing, and that is about the only use we have for knowledge. Everybody is fairly well satisfied with this assumption and its results except the class-room philosopher. If he wishes to assume that back of the qualities of the thing, and utterly different from and unrelated to them, is a mysterious "thing-in-itself" that is unknown and unknowable, nobody can forbid his making such an assumption.

(3) The conception of the infinite with which the agnostic operates, like that found in pantheism, is a wrong conception. He thinks of the infinite as the infinitely big, or spatially extended. Over against this is man with his limited capacities. Man is so small and limited that he can not grasp the unlimited. The infinite can not be compressed within the boundaries of the finite; that which is unbounded can not be bounded. But in talking about the infinite without further definition of the thing about which we are talking, or explaining in what respect it is infinite, we are only dealing with verbal abstractions. Of course, the terms infinite and finite are opposed to each other, but in talking about God and man in the Christian sense of the terms, we are dealing with more than verbal abstractions. The agnostic or pantheistic philosopher takes the terms finite and infinite in their etymological sense as opposed to each other, identifies man with the finite and God

with the infinite, and then proceeds to draw the inference that the finite can not grasp the infinite, hence man can not know God. Nothing could be easier or more dexterous as a handling of terms, and nothing could show less insight in dealing with spiritual realities.

Over against this conception of the infinite and the finite as mutually exclusive terms, is the Christian view of God as a Person infinitely rich in moral qualities, and man made in God's image as a moral person capable of communion and fellowship with God. This idea finds its highest realization in Christ as the incarnation of God—giving us man completely possessed of God, and God communicating himself in fulness of moral and spiritual life to man.

(4) Agnosticism would not always deny the possibility or reality of religion. But where it allows that religion is a legitimate human interest it would make religion primarily, if not exclusively, after the manner of pantheism, an attitude of reverence and awe toward the universe or toward the unknowable Infinite back of nature. Religion then would be mostly a matter of sentiment or feeling, sometimes with a generous place for moral and social interests and activities. Religion in that case would be either a matter of practical morality or a kind of blind mysticism, or a combination of the two.

But religion is more than morality or feeling. Moral activity and feeling are both essential elements in true religion, but religion can not be limited to either or both. Moral activity loses its sustaining motive power and enthusiasm unless it is sustained by a real knowledge of God and intelligent fellowship with him; while a mysticism that is only a matter of sentiment or feeling can very readily degenerate into fanaticism or even in extreme cases into immorality and sensualism. Man is an intelligent being as well as a being of activity and feeling. Man's intellect will not be denied its rights

in religion any more than it will in any other great concern of life. Worship must be in truth as well as in spirit.

It will appear from what is here said that there is much affinity between agnosticism and pantheism, and much of what has been said about either one will apply with almost equal force to the other. It should also be remembered, as previously pointed out, that the issue is ultimately between a personal and a sub-personal view of the world, which means in the last analysis a choice between materialism and theism.

IV. **Anti-Christian Theism.**

1. What the view holds. By this is meant a view that affirms the idea of a personal God, but denies the distinctive revelation of God in Christ. There are a number of types of this general view, but they all agree in the general affirmation and denial just mentioned. Modern Judaism is one type of this general view: Unitarianism is another. In fact there is not so much difference between progressive Judaism and "liberal Christianity" or Unitarianism. The fact, however, that there are so many types of this non-Christian theism makes it difficult to define.

In general there is a tendency among those holding this view to deny the supernatural in religion and anything in the way of authority in the spiritual realm. Some go so far as to confine revelation strictly to "natural" revelation and the idea of God to a bare theism. The distinctive features in the Christian view of sin and salvation are denied. Sin is regarded as a blunder, lack of development, but not as wilful perversity and rebellion against the will of God. Salvation is moral betterment and social uplift rather than forgiveness of personal transgressions against God. Those holding this view have usually imported into it much of the Christian view of God and man. God's love is usually emphasized and the worth of man's personal life. Some-

times emphasis is placed on immortality and freedom, though these are at times clouded, and freedom is frequently lost in the emphasis placed on law.

2. The view criticised. This view manifests a truer insight than either of the three we have been considering in that it holds to the personality of God. No theology or philosophy that ignores the facts of personality or fails to see that personality is the key to the interpretation of the world can long satisfy either the mind or the heart of man. This view is consequently much nearer the truth in making the fundamental reality of the universe a personal God than either materialism, pantheism or agnosticism.

But the same fact—that personality is the key to our understanding of the world—would also lead us on to the Christian position. The key to the understanding of human history is also a Person, the supremely creative Person of all history, especially of religious history, Jesus Christ. Any view that does not put Jesus Christ in a class by himself in his influence upon human history has not taken sufficient account of the facts. The same thing may be said as to his place in the religious experience of men. Here he stands unique.

Moreover, a bare theism creates about as many problems as it solves. Those holding this view usually lay great stress on the immanence of God in nature and man. But outside of Jesus Christ and his redemptive work this idea of the divine immanence never becomes much more than an idea; it is not realizable for any practical value. But in Jesus Christ it is more than an idea; it is a fact realizable by faith. It becomes a moral and spiritual dynamic for the transformation and uplift of men. This is a fact that has been tested out and realized in experience thousands of times. It is a fact that any general view of life must rationally interpret, not simply ignore or explain away. We hold that it is chargeable against this view, as well as the three pre-

ceding views, that it does not give a rational interpretation of the creative power of Jesus Christ in human history and experience. Further discussion of the point here, however, is unnecessary as all that was said in the chapter on Christ as the revelation of God is to the point and much that will be said later on in the volume.

One of the great mistakes made by advocates of all the four views we have been considering, as well as by many who have advocated Christianity, is in assuming that, if God is to be known at all, he is to be known by the method of speculative thought. In the realm of religion, it would be difficult to make a greater mistake. If God is to be known at all, he is to be known in religious experience. God is known in spiritual fellowship. The knowledge of God does not come to those of the greatest intellectual acumen, but to those of humble and contrite spirit. The knowledge of God is morally and spiritually conditioned. This makes Christianity a universal religion adapted to the needs of all men in all lands and ages of the world.

CHAPTER V

THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION AND THE BIBLE

I. The Bible the record of a special revelation.
  1. God and the Bible.
    (1) Man's relation to God central.
    (2) Line of witnesses for God.
    (3) A record of what God does for man.
    (4) The Bible God-inbreathed.
  2. Christ and the Bible.
    (1) The Gospel records fundamental.
      a. The teachings of Jesus.
      b. His miracles.
      c. Sacrificial quality of his life.
      d. Death, resurrection and ascension.
    (2) The glorified Christ.
      a. As Savior.
      b. As working to extend his Kingdom.
      c. As coming again.
    (3) The Old Testament fulfilled in Christ.

II. Characteristics of the Bible as the record of revelation.
  1. Deals with religion.
    (1) Objections met.
    (2) Written in popular language.
    (3) Not invalidated by changes in scientific views.
  2. Record of a progressive revelation.
    (1) Evidence for progressive revelation.
    (2) Why revelation progressive.
    (3) Moral difficulties relieved.
  3. Given through human agency.
    (1) Human and divine book.
    (2) Moral and spiritual grandeur result of divine inspiration.
  4. Authoritative.
    (1) Must be authoritative.
    (2) Does not interfere with freedom of man.

5. Purpose to awaken faith.
   (1) Faith meets the need of man's religious life.
   (2) Faith is necessary to understand the Bible.

III. The Biblical basis of Christian Doctrine.
1. The task of Christian Doctrine.
2. How to use the Bible for purposes of Christian Doctrine.
   (1) Must interpret it as a whole.
   (2) Must seek its structural principles.
   (3) Must study it in the light of Christian experience and as related to truth derived from other sources.

We have previously tried to set forth the Christian view with reference to Jesus Christ as God's final revelation of his redemptive will to mankind. We now need to consider the relation of this revelation in Christ to the Bible. If we are to enjoy the benefits of this revelation, we need the facts in regard to it in reliable and authentic form. We could not depend on the authority of the church nor the reliability of tradition to give us a knowledge of that revelation. Christianity is a historical religion. It has a definite, objective factor. The principal means of our knowledge of the objective, historical basis of Christianity is the Bible.

The question is sometimes asked, whether our acceptance of Christ depends on the testimony of the Bible or our belief in the Bible depends on the testimony of Christ. As a matter of fact, the two are closely interwoven. In the minds of Christians they are closely related. Belief in one generally carries with it the other.

I. **The Bible the record of a special revelation.** What is the relation of the Bible to the Christian revelation?

We may answer this question by saying that the Bible is the record of a special revelation of God to mankind, given through the nation of Israel and her chosen prophets, this revelation coming to a climax in Jesus Christ.

As bearing on this claim for the Bible, note the following points.

1. God and the Bible.

(1) Man's relation to God central. Man's relation to

God is the central theme of the Bible. This is true in the sense that it teaches about God and man's relation to God. It begins with "In the beginning God." It puts God back of all things. Everything else is explained by referring all things to him. He is the origin and source of all things. All man's woe grows out of a wrong relation to him. The chief theme of the Bible is how man who brought ruin upon himself by his sin may be brought back into right relationship with God. As we have in the first of Genesis an account of Paradise Lost by the sin of man, so we have at the close a beautiful description of Paradise Regained in John's picture of the heavenly Jerusalem in which God dwells in the midst of his people and constitutes their eternal blessedness.

(2) Line of witnesses for God. There is in the Bible the record of a line of witnesses for God from the beginning. At no time did he leave himself without testimony. God has always been with his people. The men whose messages we have in the Bible claimed to speak for God. They are what might be called God's select and classic witnesses of all the ages. Moses gave to Israel her system of laws under the guidance and command of God. Especially did the prophets speak in the name of Jehovah. They came with "Thus saith the Lord." Their messages were not their own but God's. At times, like Jeremiah, they would forbear to speak. But God's message was like a fire in their bones and they spake because they could not forbear. This line of witnesses comes to a climax in Jesus Christ in the New Testament in whom we have the very embodiment of the life of God.

The older view was that the Bible, as God's revelation, was a record of divine truth. Revelation was defined as the disclosure of new truth on the part of God to man. We are coming now to see that revelation is something more vital and personal. It is a self-disclosure on the

part of God. Man's chief need is not a system of theology or of religious philosophy. His first need is vital contact with God. In the Bible record that is what we find described. From the days of Enoch on men walked with God.

(3) A record of what God does for man. We know what God is by what he does. He speaks to men, but he does more than that. He sends judgment on men. He redeems their lives from destruction. The basis of God's national covenant with Israel in the Old Testament was his deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage. All subsequent writers and speakers for God in Old Testament times went back to that great national deliverance. It was this deliverance that constituted Israel a nation in covenant relation with Jehovah. He was constantly intervening on behalf of his people in their relations with other nations. His judgment upon Israel in the Babylonian captivity and then his providential deliverance of these exiles constituted another great epoch in the history of God's revelation of himself to his people. Never afterward was Israel an idolatrous people. .

In the New Testament when we come to the final revelation of God in Christ, the chief thing in this revelation of God is the death and resurrection of Christ for the salvation of men. The teachings of Christ are important; but more important are the deeds of Christ, pre-eminently the great redemptive deed in which Christ died and rose again on behalf of sinners. The dying and rising again of Christ were Christ's supreme accomplishment for man. But this deed of Christ was the deed of God. In this deed was revealed God's moral character as holy love and his redemptive purpose for man. It was on this that the New Testament writers and speakers dwelt. This was their central theme. In this we have God's final word concerning himself.

(4) The Bible God-inbreathed. The Bible, then, is

God-inbreathed.[1] It is God's message to a lost world. It has in it the vitality of God. Here man finds God. Perhaps it would be truer to say that in it God finds man. It is this that gives it its power over the lives of men. It is this that gives the Christian man his confidence with reference to the Bible in relation to the future religious history of mankind. The place of the Bible in the lives of men in the future will be determined primarily by what the Bible does for the religious lives of men and not by what critics decide about the origin and date of its books. As long as men find God in its message, so long will they love it and live by its teachings.

We do not mean to say that questions of criticism are unimportant. There are some questions that can be settled only by literary and historical criticism; such questions as the date, authorship and purpose of books. But there are two things to remember over against this. One is that men have found God in the Bible in the past. Since this is true, they can do so in the future. Their finding God, therefore, would not seem to depend on the conclusions of critics. A man no more needs to wait on the conclusions of critics to be religious than he needs to wait for the dietician to settle all scientific questions concerning food before eating his dinner. The other thing is that criticism has so settled the general historical reliability of the Bible that it can be taken for granted in a discussion of this kind. But the religious teachings of the Bible can be tested in religious experience.

The Bible serves the purpose of meeting the practical religious needs of man's life. So far as we are able to trace the origin and occasion of the books of the Bible, these books were written to meet the practical religious needs of the people of the day in which they were written. This is especially true of the books of the New

[1] 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17; 2 Peter 1: 21.

Testament. The Gospels were written when Christians began to realize that they could no longer safely depend on tradition for a knowledge of the facts of the life of Christ. The book of Acts was written to record the activities of the early Christians in spreading the gospel. The epistles of the New Testament were written to meet certain practical religious problems that arose in the early churches. Sometimes it was schism in the churches, sometimes laxness of living on the part of the members, sometimes the danger of heresy, sometimes the need of encouragement in times of persecution. In the providence of God these necessities called out certain books that meet the same or similar religious needs of Christians to-day.

2. The Bible and Christ.

The Bible finds its center and unity in Jesus Christ. It meets the religious needs of man by bringing him into touch with Jesus Christ. The Bible does not meet the needs of men by giving them a ready-made system of theology, much less a general philosophy of the universe. Christ and Christ alone can meet the religious needs of men. The Bible is the literary means of our knowledge of Christ and his revelation of God. We have already seen that it is in Christ that God comes to us.

(1) First and fundamental is the record of his life, death, resurrection and ascension as given in the Gospels. This life of Christ is fundamental in Christianity. In these records there are several elements worthy of notice:

a. Teaching. One is the teaching of Jesus. No other teacher has ever so impressed the world as has Jesus. His teaching is simple, direct, concrete, ethical and above all religious. He sets aside the traditions of the religionists of his day and appeals directly to the moral and religious consciousness of his hearers. He draws his illustrations from familiar, everyday affairs. His

parables are gems of truth and beauty and will remain so to the end of time. His teachings search the hearts of men. Many of those who for various reasons reject what they are pleased to consider dogmatic and miraculous Christianity, nevertheless appeal to the teachings of Jesus.

b. Miracles. Another prominent feature of this account of the life of Jesus is his miracles. Jesus is preeminently a miracle worker. This is just as true of Mark and of what the critics call Q, the supposed common source behind Matthew and Luke, as of the rest of the Gospel material. This is significant in as much as Mark and Q are considered the earliest written sources of the life of Christ. Evidently, if we get back to a non-miraculous Christ, we will have to go further back than any extant written sources of his life. If we take the miraculous element out of the gospel records, the records will be so torn to shreds that we will have nothing reliable left. It is impossible to take the miracles out and leave the teachings of Jesus, or indeed leave anything of value.

The miracles of Jesus are notably humanitarian and altruistic in character. He refused to exercise his miracle-working power on his own behalf. They were deeds of mercy and of love. Just as distinctly as in his teaching, do we have the benevolence of God manifested in his miracles. Nor did he work miracles to satisfy the curious. He never appealed to the miracle-monger. There is also a remarkable sanity about the records of the miracles of Jesus, a wonderful self-restraint in recording his supernatural works. Nobody has ever been able to tell how this remarkable sanity and naturalness in the accounts is to be explained if these records came from some credulous narrator or writer of a later day who superimposed these miracle stories on the true account of the life of Jesus.

c. Sacrificial quality. The whole life of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels was one of helpfulness and sacrificial service. One who was supposed to know summed up his life in the words: "He went about doing good."[1] This life of service has wonderfully impressed the world. His passion was to help men. This unchallengeable goodness of Jesus constituted a valuable element in his revelation of God.

d. Death, resurrection and ascension. A large amount of space comparatively is given to the last week of the life of Jesus, his death and resurrection. According to the synoptic account Jesus began definitely to foretell his death and resurrection from the time of the great confession at Cæsarea Philippi. The conviction of the writer is that Jesus foresaw his death at least as early as his baptism and in his baptism devoted himself to death for the salvation of men. This would help to explain the point of temptation when the devil suggested that he give up the long, tortuous way of the cross and suffering as the method of winning the world back to God and take the short cut of worshiping his Satanic majesty and thereby receive as a gift the kingdoms of the world and their glory.

The life of Jesus apparently comes to an ignominious anti-climax in a shameful death on the cross. He was crucified as a malefactor. The world repudiated him. But God reversed the world's judgment by raising him from the dead. By many infallible proofs he manifested himself alive to his bewildered and doubting disciples. After giving them instruction in matters pertaining to the kingdom he ascended before their eyes.

We have dwelt somewhat on the Gospel account of Jesus because of its fundamental importance in the Christian revelation.

(2) The rest of the New Testament presents him as the glorified Christ. Beginning with the Acts Jesus is

[1]Acts 10: 38.

still the center of the New Testament account, but the point of view has changed. It is no longer the earthly life of Jesus, but it is now the glorified Christ who is presented to us. The Gospels present Jesus in his earthly life, looking forward to the glorification and ending with that. The rest of the New Testament presents the glorified Christ, but it is the Christ who once lived on earth and whose glory life is a continuation of the life of humiliation on earth.

With reference to the New Testament account in relation to the glorified Christ, the following points are made prominent:

a. The glorified Christ is Savior. It is the glorified Christ who is the object of saving faith. His is the only name given among men whereby we must be saved.[1] God has exalted him at his right hand as a Prince and a Savior, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins.[2] Subsequent to Pentecost the Christians of the New Testament looked back to the earthly life of Jesus, but that was the secondary element in their faith. The primary element in their faith was the upward look to the risen, ascended Jesus whom God had invested with the power and authority of spiritual lordship in the resurrection and ascension. It was the appearance of this risen Christ to Paul that changed him from the archpersecutor of the church to the first Christian of all history.

b. He works to extend his kingdom. This exalted Christ works by his Spirit, through his people, to extend his kingdom in the world. The work which he began during his earthly life he now continues in this more effective method.[3] He empowered his people for the work of testifying to him by sending the Spirit on the day of Pentecost.[4] The presence of the Spirit consti-

[1]Acts 4: 12.
[2]Acts 5: 31.
[3]Acts 1: 1.
[4]Acts 2: 33.

tutes the spiritual presence of Jesus himself which he promised to his people.[1] The campaign conducted by the living Christ to overthrow the forces of darkness and sin and establish his own kingdom of light and truth in its place is the theme of the book of Revelation.

c. He comes again. He comes again to consummate his kingdom. This living Christ is one day to come back to earth to raise the dead and judge the world, and thereby put down forever all sin and evil in God's world. This is to be the consummation of the kingdom of God. The time kingdom is thereby brought to its finality and the eternal kingdom ushered in. This is the great hope of the New Testament Christians. To this consummation they looked with eager, longing eyes.

(3) The Old Testament finds its fulfilment in Christ. But what about the Old Testament? It is a partial and preparatory revelation which finds its significance in Christ. The Old Testament is everywhere a forward-looking book. The whole life of Israel in the Old Testament is typical. There are promises and predictions from the protevangelium of Gen. 3: 15 on that find their fulfilment in Christ. There are typical persons, such as Moses, Joshua, David and Solomon; typical events, such as the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt; typical institutions, such as the tabernacle, the temple, the passover, sacrifices in general, the priesthood. There were special Messianic passages such as the promise to David concerning his son and his eternal kingdom, and the Messianic psalms, such as the second, the eighth, the one hundred and tenth, and such as the great chapter on the suffering Servant in Isa. 53.

The New Testament everywhere looks upon Christ as the fulfilment of these Old Testament promises and institutions. His birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension are represented as fulfilling Old Testament promises and predictions. Jesus says that he came to

[1]See Matt. 18: 20; 28: 20; John 14: 18.

fulfill the law.[1] The Scriptures, he says, testify of him.[2] He explains to his disciples, after his resurrection, how he is the fulfilment of the law, the prophets and the psalms.[3] So on through the New Testament. The Book of Hebrews especially sets forth how Christ is the reality toward which Old Testament types and shadows pointed.

II. **Some characteristics of the Bible as the record of revelation.** Let us notice now some of the qualities of the Bible as the record of God's revelation to men.

1. The Bible deals with religion. After what has been said, it is hardly necessary to say that the Bible is a religious book. This quality of the Bible is perfectly evident, yet it has not always been kept in mind. If it had been, it would have saved a good deal of trouble.

(1) If this be remembered, it will help with reference to many of the questions that are raised about it and objections that are urged against it. The Bible is not an authority on mathematics, science and many other questions in which men are interested. For instance, many objections have been urged against the Bible on scientific grounds and much energy has been expended in meeting these objections. If men had grasped the principle that the Bible deals with religion and only incidentally with other questions as they were related to the fundamental questions of religion, the debaters would have seen that they were debating a fictitious issue.

(2) The Bible was not written in scientific but popular language. We still say the sun sets and speak of the four corners of the earth, in spite of the fact that we know that neither expression is scientifically accurate. Any man who insisted on conducting a courtship in scientifically exact language would never reach the

[1]Matt. 5: 17ff.
[2]John 5: 39, 46.
[3]Luke 24: 44ff.

state of matrimonial bliss. He might know science, but he would plainly show that he knew nothing about a woman. The fair sex would leave him where he belonged as to matrimonial relations. And a man who expects a book on religion to be written in technical, scientific language shows about as much wisdom. This does not mean that the Bible was written in language that had no definite meaning. But it is the language of the people, the language of everyday intercourse, not the language of the cloister or the laboratory.

Besides, suppose the Bible had been written in scientific terminology. In the language of whose science, or the science of what nationality or age should it be written? And if it had been written in the scientific terminology of to-day, tomorrow it would be out of date, for science changes from age to age. Moreover, only the technical scholar could understand a book written in technical terminology. The Bible was not written for scholars only, it was written for men.

(3) The religious teachings of the Bible are not invalidated by a change in scientific views. Some men seem to think that, because the general view of the world held by the Biblical writers has been discredited by science, therefore, the religious teachings of the Bible can be no longer accepted. But suppose the Biblical writers did think the world flat. Suppose they did not know half as much about the physical universe as present-day scientists. All that might be true, and at the same time the Biblical writer could know much more of God and true religion than many scientists. A man may be a very good authority on chemistry or physics or biology or astronomy and be a very poor authority in spiritual matters. Yet one would get the impression from the air of certainty with which some of them rule Jesus and Paul out of court in matters of religion that these same scientists considered themselves experts in matters pertaining to God and the soul (when they

condescend to let us believe in God or have a soul). As a matter of fact, the only science that ever raises a real issue with the Bible and its teachings is a science that is not science; that is, instead of being science it is usually an anti-theistic metaphysics which passes itself off in the name of science and uses the good name of science as a cloak to gain credence among men who do not discover the disguise.

2. The Bible is the record of a progressive revelation. This point together with the one just considered will help to solve most of the difficulties that arise in regard to the Bible.

(1) Evidence that revelation is progressive. That revelation as recorded in the Bible is progressive few men to-day would deny. Yet it has not been always clearly grasped. The author of the book of Hebrews shows in the first verse of his epistle that he understood this principle. So did Jesus. He came to fill full a revelation that was incomplete.[1] So did Paul. He says that Christ came in the fulness of time.[2] A revelation historically conditioned could hardly be otherwise. We can see this in the doctrine of God in the Bible. In the first part of the Old Testament emphasis is laid upon God's power. His moral qualities are not disregarded, but they do not receive the emphasis that we find later on in the psalms and prophets. And we do not come to the climax of the Biblical view of God until we get to the revelation of God in Christ as recorded in the New Testament.

(2) Why revelation must be progressive. But why the long delay in bringing revelation to a climax? Because the giving of a revelation on God's part is morally and spiritually conditioned on man's part. There were moral, social, political and spiritual conditions involved. These conditions must mature before God's final revelation could be given. God does not hurry.

[1]Matt. 5: 17ff. [2]Gal. 4: 4.

He waits until things are right to accomplish his purposes.

This must not be interpreted to mean that revelation is only a naturalistic evolution, or that it could be given only as things of themselves developed so that it could be given. One part of the giving of the revelation was the creation on God's part of such conditions as would make it possible for man to receive the revelation. God can give only as man receives; but man's receptivity is God's creation. But in creating this receptivity, or in other words bringing about the conditions necessary to the reception of a revelation, he is limited by the conditions with which he deals.

(3) There are certain moral difficulties which this principle will relieve. Jesus recognized this principle as applied to moral questions in what he said about divorce.[1] If one looks upon the teachings of the Bible as all being on the same moral and spiritual plane, these difficulties are insoluble. Such questions as the wholesale destruction of enemies at God's command will then be relieved, if not solved. Such a question can not be solved simply by referring it to the sovereignty of God. Even a sovereign God must do right. But when we understand that the men God was using to carry out his purpose were men of very low moral ideals as compared with a later age and remember that the nations to be destroyed were so morally and spiritually corrupt that their complete extermination was probably the best thing for the world, then the question is not so difficult. Does not God yet use the nations to scourge one another? And do not the innocent yet suffer on account of the sins of others? Or take the matter of the imprecatory psalms. The psalmist seemed to think it would be a pious thing to destroy the infant children of his enemies.[2] Should a Christian feel that way toward his enemies to-day? Certainly not. But any man should be

[1]Matt. 19: 3-12. [2]Ps. 137: 8, 9.

measured by the moral standards of his day, not by those of a later day. Besides, if God could not use imperfect men, how long would he have to wait before finding a man he could use? He manifests his wisdom by the use of imperfect men, especially if they are upright in heart and have their faces set in the right direction.

When it comes to a practical use of the Bible, no man believes that all parts of it are of equal value. No one would put some genealogical table in the Old Testament on the same level with John 3: 16. Yet this would not mean that the genealogical table did not have its place. My finger nail is not of as much vital importance to my body as my heart. Yet it is a part of my body and I would not needlessly cut it off. If a man should start out to trim his body down to the essential organs and cut off all members that he could live without he would remind us of some of the "shorter Bibles."

3. The Bible is God's message given through human agency. The Bible did not grow up out of man's life, but it came from God to meet the needs of man's life.

(1) Is the Bible a human book or a divine book? It is both. It was written by men inspired of God. Its message came from God, but he used the Biblical writers to communicate that message to man. And in recording that message each man was free. He did not lose his individuality. Man was as free and as truly himself as if God had had nothing to do with the giving of the message and putting it into written form. Yet the message was as truly divine as if man had had nothing to do with it. Each writer has his own style and peculiar methods of thought. He tells things in his own way.

One of the greatest causes of trouble concerning the Bible has been the assumption in men's minds, often unconsciously held, that the human and divine elements were mutually antagonistic and exclusive. This assumption has wrought pernicious results in many places; for

example, in the doctrine of the person of Christ, in the doctrine of salvation by grace as related to man's freedom, regeneration and faith, preservation and perseverance, and so on. In regard to the Bible, men have often assumed that, if God inspired men to write the Bible, then man must cease to be himself, think his own thoughts, write in his own style, tell things from his own viewpoint—in fact, that man must become a passive, if not an unconscious, instrument in the hands of God—not realizing that it is only in God that man comes to his true self in the proper use of his powers.

(2) The moral and spiritual grandeur of the Bible comes from divine inspiration. From the beginning there is a moral and spiritual grandeur about the Bible that we do not find in any other body of literature. In this respect, it is in a class by itself. This quality belongs to it by virtue of the fact that it is God-inspired. It has the life of God in its message. This quality of the revelation does not come from man. It comes from God. Yet it is not foreign to man's life as a cinder in the eye is foreign to it. It rather is like light to the eye; it is that for which the eye was made and without which it can not perform its proper function.

4. The Bible is authoritative.

(1) Is the Bible authoritative? Emphatically yes. It is authoritative as the voice of God is authoritative to the soul of man. It finds man, searches him, makes him realize his need of spiritual help. If God speaks to man, he must speak in the tones of authority. He is not simply offering to man advice on spiritual matters which man may accept or reject as a matter of indifference. He speaks about man's sin, his salvation and destiny, in tones that are authoritative. There is a moral imperative in the message. Men talk to-day of a democratic God as if God were one of the common herd and as if his voice had no more authority than that of any other member of the mob. The Bible knows no such God. The God of the

Bible is a God of holiness who speaks to man by way of command.

(2) The authority of the Bible does not interfere with the freedom of man. But here we come to an objection. The objection is that an external authority of this kind would interfere with man's freedom, with his moral and spiritual autonomy. It is objected that submission to any external authority is subversive of the freedom of man and hence of his highest development. This is a mistaken notion. There is no conflict between submission to proper authority and freedom. In fact, the only way man can realize his true freedom is by submission to rightful authority. Refusal to submit to rightful authority is not freedom. This is spiritual anarchy.

Yet much, if not most, of the objection to the authority of the Bible is based on this mistaken notion with reference to the relation of authority to freedom.

Let us see if this general statement can be made clearer. One thing that will help us is to remember that the authority of the Bible is the authority of Christ. This follows from what has been said about the relation of the Bible and Christ. We do not have two authorities, one, the authority of Christ; the other, the authority of the Bible; but one. Christ speaks to us through the Bible. Authority is ultimately personal in its nature. Our ultimate authority in Christianity is the authority of Christ as the revelation of God. The Bible is the medium through which his will is made known to us. As the revelation of the mind and will of Christ the Bible is authoritative. But the authority of Christ does not enslave, it liberates. Paul gloried in his liberty as a Christian. Yet he called himself the slave of Christ. By submission to the spiritual authority of Christ man finds his spiritual freedom.

The authority of the Bible, then, is the authority of the grace of God as mediated to us in Christ, the grace that delivers from the guilt and bondage of sin. As Paul shows in Rom. 6, there are only two possible masters for

man, either sin or Christ. When Christ, as the mediator of the grace of God, delivers us from sin he brings us under captivity to himself. The authority, then, that masters us as Christians is the authority of God's holy love in Christ Jesus. It is a bondage that brings under bondage to itself, but it is a willing bondage of love. Grace captures our hearts and sets us free from the bondage of sin.

It is commonly said that, in the reformation of Luther, so far as authority is concerned, an infallible Bible was put in the place of an infallible pope; the authority of the church was displaced by the authority of the Bible. But this does not express the whole matter. The locus of authority was changed, but not only the locus but also the nature of that authority was changed. The authority of the church is repressive and oppressive in its nature. Man is asked to accept without question what the church prescribes in the realm of doctrine to be believed and in the realm of morals to be practiced. In these realms the church demands blind, unquestioning obedience. Man's mind and conscience are enslaved. There is no room for freedom of thought or inquiry as to what is right. All is decided for him. The Bible is not that kind of authority. For a free, moral being there can be no such authority. There is no authority that obviates the necessity on our part of seeking to know the right and striving to do it. There is no authority for man that gives him an off-hand solution of all moral and spiritual problems. The Bible is sometimes represented as a book of statutes of that nature, but it is not. We must make our own moral decisions. We must seek to know the truth. Conscience and reason are not to be suppressed, but exercised, in knowing what is right and true. There is no authority for a rational being except one that is rationally accepted, rationally interpreted and rationally followed. There is no authority for a free being except one that is freely accepted and freely obeyed. The authority of the Bible does not suppress

but stimulates and develops personality. An authoritative church or authoritative creeds give us an authority that is oppressive in its nature. The Bible is not that kind of an authority. One of the outstanding books in recent times on the question of authority in religion is Sabatier's "Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit," the very title of which implies that a spiritual religion is one that excludes authority and that an authoritative religion is unspiritual. But this is a fundamental mistake. If God is not a God of authority, he is no God at all. If God does not reveal himself, religion is impossible. Therefore, if God reveals himself to man, it must be in an authoritative way. But the nature of this authority must correspond to the nature of man and the nature of the relation between God and man. That relation is the relation of a free, finite person, man, to the infinite, holy God. Therefore, the authority that belongs to the relation of God to man must respect the nature of man as a free personal being. Man's conscience, freedom and reason must not be overridden. The purpose of this revelation is rather to stimulate, develop and guide these. This is what we find that the Bible does for men.

All truth is authoritative. And the nature of the authority depends on the nature of the truth. Mathematical truth is of such a nature that if one sees it he must accept it. He has little if any option. The truth in this realm is of such a nature that it cannot be denied. To do so is to impeach one's intelligence. In the realm of physical science also truth is authoritative. If one wishes to obtain a certain chemical compound, he must bring together certain chemical elements in a certain proportion under certain conditions. If he changes the elements, their proportion or the conditions under which they are brought together, he will not secure the desired result. In regard to these matters there is no option. The chemist need not complain that his freedom is in-

terfered with or that he ought to be allowed to prescribe the elements, their proportion or the conditions under which they should be brought together. The truth here is inexorable in its authority. The experimenter must comply with the predetermined conditions or fail.

So in the realm of religion, truth is also authoritative, but the nature of the authority belonging to the truth depends on the nature of the realities dealt with. The realities are God and man in their personal relations. The purpose of the revelation of God to man is that man shall be lifted up out of sin and recreated in the moral and spiritual image of God. To do this man needs, not an authority that enslaves conscience and reason and thus suppresses personality, but rather one that emancipates conscience and reason and develops man as a free personality in right relationship with God. Such an authority is the Bible.

5. The purpose of the Bible is to awaken faith in man. (1) By doing this it meets the needs of man's religious life. The proper function of the Bible is to awaken and develop faith in man. The Christian life is a life of faith. The Bible meets the needs of the religious life by producing the life of faith. The proper response on the part of man to the Biblical message is faith. As already shown, Christ is the center of the Biblical message, and what Christ calls for on man's part is faith. Without faith it is impossible to understand or appreciate the Biblical message which centers in Christ.

(2) Without faith the Bible can not be understood. To approach the Bible, then, in a spirit of cold criticism or bald rationalism is to guarantee beforehand that we shall fail to understand it. This does not mean that we shall approach it in a spirit of credulity, determined beforehand not to subject its contents to an intelligent criticism. Such an attitude could not be asked for in the name of intelligent faith. There are certain questions of date, authorship, historical reliability, etc., that

must be settled by historical and literary criticism. There is no other way to settle them. But the Bible is more than a book of literature and history. It is a book of religion, presenting to us a revelation from God centering in the person of Jesus Christ. As such the only way to test it, appreciate it, understand it, is by a response of faith on our part. One can no more properly evaluate the Bible as a revelation from God without faith than he can evaluate sunshine without eyes or a musical composition without ears. This is not begging the question by asking that one blindly accept without proof the Bible as a revelation from God. It is simply saying that for a world of realities around us there must be certain powers of perception and appreciation on our part, and where the power of perception on our part is lacking there can be no appreciation of that particular form of reality. A world of visual objects means nothing to a blind man; a world of sounds means nothing to a deaf man; and a world of spiritual realties means nothing to one without faith. Faith is the sympathetic response of the whole personality of man to God as revealed in Jesus Christ. This message about Christ comes to us in the Bible. The man who responds in faith to this revelation finds God as the great reality that satisfies his religious nature and the religious needs of his life. This response is not an unintelligent response. Man responds as an intelligent being. As his faith becomes more and more intelligent and self-conscious, man has a more or less coherent and consistent body of religious doctrine, interpreting to himself and to others his religious faith.

III. **The Biblical basis of Christian Doctrine.**

1. The task of Christian Doctrine. What has been said about the Bible will justify, we believe, the statement that any system of Christian doctrine must be grounded in the Bible. No teaching that is anti-Biblical can be accepted as true to Christianity. This does not mean, however,

that a system of Christian doctrine is to be the mere exegesis of portions of Scripture or of the Scriptures as a whole. That is the work of Biblical exegesis. Nor is it to be the setting forth in systematic form of the religious doctrines of the Biblical writers. That is the task of Biblical theology, especially if the teachings are set forth in the order of their development. Rather is it the task of Christian doctrine to set forth the structural and organic principles of the Christian religion as these are to be found in a study of the Bible, interpreted in the light of Christian experience and history and as these principles are related to what we know of God and spiritual truth from other sources.

2. How to use the Bible for the purposes of Christian Doctrine.

(1) The Bible must be interpreted as a whole as a unified and organic body of truth. Every passage must be interpreted, not only in the light of the immediate context and as a part of a book and as having a part in the teaching of a certain writer, but also as a part of the whole body of revealed truth.

(2) As indicated above, we study the Bible to find not only its explicit teachings, but also its structural principles, its underlying presuppositions with reference to God, man and the world. Many of its passages we will not be directly concerned about, because they do not deal with the fundamental doctrines and principles of Christianity.

(3) We will study the Bible, then, in the light of our own spiritual experience of redemption and fellowship with God through faith in Christ, with the effort to relate the principles of Christianity as we see them in the Bible to truth derived from other sources.

PART TWO

The Christian Conception of Christ and God

CHAPTER I

THE PERSON OF CHRIST

I. The Teaching of the New Testament.
   1. The humanity of Jesus.
   2. The sinlessness of Jesus.
   3. The virgin birth.
   4. The resurrection.
   5. The ascension.
   6. The pre-existence.
   7. Jesus as Savior.
   8. Jesus as Lord.
   9. The deity of Jesus.
      (1) Teaching of particular passages.
      (2) The attitude of faith toward him.
         a. What faith is.
            (a) Trust in Jesus as Savior.
            (b) Surrender to him as Lord.
         b. Results of faith.
            (a) Moral transformation.
            (b) Love for all men.
            (c) The love of God realized.
            (d) Conscious fellowship with God.
            (e) Spiritual perception of Christ as divine.

II. The two nature controversy.
   1. A summary of views.
      (1) Ebionitic.
      (2) Docetic.
      (3) Arian.
      (4) Apollinarian.
      (5) Nestorian.
      (6) Eutychian.
      (7) Orthodox.
   2. Observations and conclusions.
      (1) Method too abstract and *a priori*.

(2) Fundamental concept substance rather than personality.
(3) Results correct on presuppositions of the method.

III. False and inadequate modern views.
1. Humanitarian view.
2. View of Schleiermacher.
3. View of Ritschl.

IV. The mystery of the incarnation.
1. Mystery no reason for rejecting the doctrine.
2. The problem misconceived.

V. The incarnation viewed as a self-emptying.
1. Paul's statement.
2. Theories of self-emptying.
(1) Gess and Beecher.
(2) Thomasins.
(3) Dr. Strong.
(4) Prof. Sunday.

VI. The reascent.
1. Phases of his growth.
(1) General statement of Luke.
(2) Moral development.
(3) Religious life.
(4) Messianic consciousness.
2. The element of struggle and temptation in his development.
3. The supreme struggle.
4. Objections to the idea of growth.
(1) On ground of his sinlessness.
(2) On ground of his deity.
5. Theory of a gradual incarnation.
6. Jesus the supreme example of self-realization through self-sacrifice.
7. Scriptures setting forth the exaltation of Jesus.
8. The significance of the exaltation.

We have considered Christ as the revelation of God. We need now to consider the Christian teaching in regard to the person of Christ. Of course, the two things are directly and vitally related. What Christ is as the revelation of God is a vital element in the doctrine of his person and will largely determine what we shall think of him in other respects. On the other hand, our doctrine of the person of Christ will necessarily determine

largely what we think of him as the revelation of God. This is one of the fundamental questions of Christian theology and one that has held the attention of thinkers in this realm from New Testament days to the present.

I. **The teaching of the New Testament.** Let us first consider in brief outline the teaching of the New Testament concerning the person of Christ.

1. The humanity of Jesus. It seems strange that anybody should ever have questioned the genuine humanity of Jesus. Theoretically, very few have ever done so. This was done, however, by the docetics who held that the body of Jesus was not real; that he was not real man, but only God appearing in human form. This, while a fatal heresy, shows, on the other hand, how firmly the conviction of the deity of Christ had laid hold on the minds of Christians in early Christian history. Again, while not many Christian thinkers have ever been professedly docetic and thus theoretically denied the humanity of Christ, there has been all along a decidedly docetic tendency on the part of many. That is, many theologians have so emphasized the deity of Christ, and assumed such a chasm between God and man, that they have practically nullified the human life of Jesus. This has been done in the interest of a theoretical construction of the person of Christ, largely overlooking or ignoring the facts of history as recorded in the New Testament. This is a fundamentally wrong procedure. We should not begin with the abstract question as to how we will get deity and humanity together in a personal life. In a purely abstract and deductive way we may not be able to solve that question. But, after all, that may not be such a serious thing. Instead of arguing in an *a priori* manner to prove that God and man may be united in a human life, we should begin with the facts of the life of Jesus as recorded in the New Testament. If we do, we should not argue toward a human life for Jesus. We

will rather begin with that as a datum. That will be our starting point rather than our stopping place. Nobody who takes the New Testament seriously will ever question the humanity of Jesus. The New Testament emphatically protests against a docetic tendency that was appearing before the close of the New Testament age.[1]

The New Testament tells us how Jesus was born, had family connections, lived in his home at Nazareth, was subject to his parents, rejoiced, was tempted, craved human sympathy, prayed, was obedient to God, had a body, mind, soul, suffered, died and rose again. John's Gospel and First Epistle are usually looked upon as setting forth the deity of Christ. This is true, but notice also how they emphasize his humanity. The Gospel tells that he became flesh and dwelt among us, that he was tired, thirsty, hungry; while the Epistle begins by emphasizing the fact that the writer with others had seen, heard, beheld, handled the word of life.[2]

While Paul has little to say about the earthly life of Jesus, he does speak of his having been born of a woman,[3] of his being a man,[4] of his death and resurrection,[5] of his being the head of a new spiritual humanity as the last Adam.[6] In all his discussions Paul everywhere presupposes the facts of the earthly life of Jesus, and nobody would have been further than Paul from denying the humanity of Jesus.

The book of Hebrews lays special emphasis on the humanity of Jesus. He laid hold on humanity or took our nature, because it was man he came to save.[7] He can be touched with the feeling of our infirmity because he has been tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin.[8] He made his prayer to God with strong

[1]John 1: 14; 1 John 1: 1-3; 4: 2, 3; Col. 2: 20-23.
[2]John 1: 18; 4: 6ff; 1 John 1: 1-3.
[3]Gal. 4: 4.
[4]1 Tim. 2: 5.
[5]1 Cor. 15: 3, 4.
[6]1 Cor. 15: 22; Rom. 5: 12ff.
[7]2: 14.
[8]4: 15.

crying and tears.[1] He feared and learned obedience though he was a Son.[2]

Everywhere the New Testament presents Jesus as a man. This is so obvious that it is not necessary to dwell on it further. Some bearings and phases of this will be discussed in connection with other topics.

2. The sinlessness of Jesus. There was one respect, however, in which Jesus was different from all other men. He was sinless. He challenged his enemies to convict him of sin.[3] He forgave sins.[4] He said that his blood was shed for the remission of sins.[5] He had a consciousness of undimmed fellowship with God.[6]

Another thing of great significance. Jesus taught that all men should confess their sins and pray for forgiveness.[7] He denounced those who claimed to be righteous above others. Yet he himself never confessed sin, never prayed for forgiveness, never manifested the least consciousness of sin. What shall we say of one who taught that all other men should confess their sins while not confessing sin on his own part? Will we not have to say that he is either sinless or that he is such a moral pervert that he does not know his own moral condition? One who, if a sinner, was so blinded by moral darkness and self-conceit as not to know his own spiritual condition and needs would certainly be no proper guide for others in spiritual matters.

3. The virgin birth. Another matter over which there has been much dispute in recent years is the question of the virgin birth of Jesus. Matthew and Luke represent that Jesus was born of Mary without a human father. According to their account, he was begotten by the Holy Spirit. There seems to be enough difference between these two to show that they are independent accounts. Neither writer has borrowed from the other.

[1]5: 7.
[2]5: 8.
[3]John 8: 46.
[4]Mark 2: 5; Luke 7: 48.
[5]Matt. 26: 28.
[6]Matt. 11: 27; John 11: 42; 14: 6-11.
[7]Matt. 6: 12; Luke 11: 4.

Many objections have been urged against these accounts. So far as textual or literary criticism is concerned the accounts so far stand. The only ground on which the accounts can be rejected is on the ground that they bring in a miraculous element and miracles can not be allowed. But this is not scientific criticism. It is dogmatism of the most dogmatic kind. Of course, any feature of the gospel account could be disposed of that way. But we have no right to assume beforehand that such and such a thing could not have happened, therefore, it did not. We should first of all examine the evidence.

The fact that the other New Testament writers do not mention the virgin birth is no proof that it did not take place. Possibly the other writers did not know about it, or if they did know about it, did not see fit to mention it We can understand that such a topic would naturally be handled with great reserve among the early disciples. Hence it may not have been known outside of a small circle of friends of the family, and if the other New Testament writers did know about it, naturally such a topic would not be a matter of common conversation and men would not write about it unnecessarily. Mark begins his account of the life of Jesus with the public ministry. What John says about the eternal Logos as becoming flesh would fit in with such an idea. So would Paul's doctrine of the pre-existent Christ as coming in human form.[1]

It is not a sufficient explanation of these accounts to say that they are due to the influence of certain Old Testament passages which seem to expect a virgin birth, such as Isa. 7: 14. These prophetic passages are not clear enough in predicting the virgin birth to account for the New Testament passages unless the New Testament passages had a basis in fact. On the other hand, we can see how with knowledge of the actual virgin birth of

[1] 2 Cor. 8: 9; Phil. 2: 5-10.

Jesus before them the New Testament writers would interpret the Old Testament passages in that sense. To explain those accounts on the ground that they are due to the influence of certain Gentile stories of women who gave birth to heroes or gods without human father is greatly to exaggerate the influence of non-Jewish religious beliefs on the New Testament accounts.

Some set the accounts aside as of no religious value. But such an origin of the earthly life of Jesus would fit into the account of such a life as he lived. If his life had been a life such as other men lived, then it would be natural to expect such an origin as belongs to the lives of other men. But the virgin birth fits into the account of the sinless life. Luke 1: 35 indicates that there was a connection between the holiness of Jesus and the fact that Mary was overshadowed by the power of the Most High. Would not his origin in such an act of the Holy Spirit help us to understand how, of all men, his is the only exception to the fact that men live under the dominion of sin?

Perhaps, after all, it is pretty largely a matter of prepossessions. If one comes to the accounts with the idea that the life of Jesus must be reduced to the level of all other human lives, especially if he comes with the idea that miracles could not take place, he will then very likely set the accounts aside as unhistorical and explain them on the ground that they were read into the account by somebody later than the generation in which Jesus lived. On the other hand, if one believes in Jesus as sinless, and particularly if he has had an experience in his own life of his sin-delivering power, he will likely accept the accounts as falling naturally in with the account of such an one as he is known to be.

4. The resurrection. A discussion of the person of Christ would be incomplete without a consideration of his resurrection. Jesus died. Nobody disputes that. But the question is whether his body remained in the

tomb in which it was placed or whether he rose from the dead and appeared to his disciples.

The Gospel accounts tell us that on the morning of the third day some women went to the tomb and found it empty. An angel announced to them that Jesus was risen.[1] Jesus himself appeared to them.[2] He appeared to Peter.[3] He also appeared to two of them on the way to Emmaus.[4] He also appeared to all of the eleven except Thomas.[5] Later he appeared to the eleven, Thomas being present.[6] He appeared to the eleven in Galilee.[7]

Paul tells us that Jesus appeared to James, to Peter, to himself, to more than five hundred at one time.[8] Notice that Paul puts his own vision of Christ in the same category as his appearance to James and Peter. He seems to class it as an objective appearance, not simply a subjective vision. Notice also that he says that of the five hundred to whom he appeared more than half were living at the time he wrote.

It is evident from the Gospel accounts that the disciples did not expect Jesus to rise from the dead.[9] It is sometimes said that they expected him to rise, but the whole New Testament account shows that they had no such expectation. When Jesus was crucified all their hopes were gone. They gave up now in despair. They would not believe until they had overwhelming evidence. Such evidence they had.[10] It was no mere apparition that convinced them that Jesus was alive.

It is generally admitted that the disciples believed that Jesus rose from the dead. The idea that they stole the body of Jesus away and reported that he had risen has now been generally abandoned. How came the disciples to believe that Jesus rose? Their own prepossessions

[1]Matt. 28: 1-8 and parallels.
[2]Matt. 28: 8, 9; John 20: 14ff.
[3]1 Cor. 15: 5.
[4]Luke 24: 13ff.
[5]Luke 24: 36ff; John 20: 19ff.
[6]John 20: 26ff.
[7]Matt. 28: 16ff.
[8]1 Cor. 15: 5ff.
[9]Luke 24: 11, 21ff; John 20: 24, 25; Matt. 28: 17.
[10]Acts 1: 3.

were all in the other direction. There was nothing in the social situation to produce such a belief on their part. Everything was against their believing except the evidence. If they came to believe it, it must have been because there was evidence that was fully convincing. They were men of ordinary intelligence who knew how to use their senses. The evidence is that they saw Jesus, heard him, touched him, had social intercourse with him. They record the teachings which Jesus gave them during this period. There is no way to account for the belief of the disciples that Jesus rose except on the supposition that he did rise.

Their belief that Jesus had risen brought over them a great change. They were transformed from a band of discouraged, downcast men into a company of joyous, militant, aggressive propagandists. Did a mistaken belief in the resurrection of Jesus, based on some kind of an apparition that they should have recognized as an apparition, work this transformation in the disciples?

When they went out to preach they preached Jesus as risen from the dead. This message proved to be a message of power. How could such a message win in such a situation? Was it a message of truth or was it simply a mistaken notion of theirs? Why should a false report that Jesus had risen from the dead work such a transformation in them and through them in others?

Then there is the testimony of Paul. What was it that wrought the change in Paul? What changed Saul the persecutor of the church to Paul the greatest Christian and advocate of Christianity the world has yet seen? Paul says that the thing that changed him was the appearance to him of the risen Christ. He says that he saw Christ. Was Paul mistaken? What convinced Paul that Jesus was alive? Remember that Paul's testimony comes to us in epistles that practically all critics admit were written by him before 60 A.D. Who is more apt to be correct about what changed Paul—Paul himself

or some modern philosopher or so-called scientist who speculates at a distance of over 1900 years as to how such a thing might have taken place? Does the modern speculator understand Paul's experience better than Paul did? Paul says that what changed him was the appearance to him of Jesus alive from the dead. The modern speculator says that it was some kind of a subjective experience of reflection that convinced Paul that faith in Jesus was a better method of obtaining peace with God than keeping the law. And presto! Paul faces about, braves danger and death in renouncing his ancestral religion and preaching Jesus in nearly all the great centers of the Roman empire! The man who believes that need not accuse the Christian of being credulous in believing the resurrection of the dead.

There is no evidence in the New Testament that anybody denied the resurrection of Jesus. True, the guards were instructed to say that his disciples stole the body away. But they were to do this as a means of avoiding the evident force of the fact that he had risen.[1] In the Acts the Jewish leaders command the Apostles not to teach in the name of Jesus. But there is no intimation that they denied the resurrection which the Apostles were preaching. If they wished to crush this new movement, why did they not deny its main message? Why did not somebody challenge its affirmation? Why did not somebody produce the body of Jesus? That would have settled the whole thing. When Paul argues the question of the resurrection with the Corinthians, there is no indication that anyone denied the resurrection of Jesus. Some seemed to deny or doubt the future resurrection of the believer, but Paul argues with them on the basis of the resurrection of Jesus as if that were an accepted fact.[2]

5. The ascension. Following the resurrection the New Testament represents Jesus as ascending. He led his

[1]Matt. 28: 11-15. [2]1 Cor. 15: 12ff.

disciples out from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives and there in view of his disciples ascended up into heaven.[1] But he did not cease to be real to the disciples. He now became to them a spiritual reality rather than a corporeal presence. They think of him now as seated at the right hand of the Majesty on High.[2] Peter says on the day of Pentecost that God has made him both Lord and Christ.[3] Paul says that by the resurrection from the dead he was instated in a position of power according to the Spirit of holiness.[4] The whole New Testament after the Gospels is written from the standpoint of the exalted Christ. The writers do not so much look back to the historic Jesus as they look up to the glorified Christ. The book of Acts is an account of what this Christ is doing by his Spirit through his people. Luke begins by telling Theophilus that in his former treatise (the Gospel) he has told what Jesus began to do and teach, as much as to say that in this book he goes on to write what Jesus continues to do and teach.[5] The book of Acts, then, is not so much the acts of the Apostles (it does not seem to try to give an account of all the Apostles) as it is the acts of Christ working by his Spirit through his people (some of them laymen like Stephen and Philip rather than Apostles). Christ sends the Holy Spirit.[6]

Paul regards Christ from the standpoint of the glorified Christ. He will know him no more after the flesh; that is, simply as living an earthly life.[7] The book of Hebrews views Christ the same way.[8] So does the book of Revelation. The key to Revelation is found in the view of the living Christ which John had in chapter 1 (verse 12ff). Further consideration will be given this matter a little later.

[1]Luke 24: 50, 51; Acts 1: 9.
[2]Acts 2: 33ff; 7: 56; Heb. 1: 3; cf. 1 Cor. 15: 25ff.
[3]Acts 2: 36.
[4]Rom. 1: 4.
[5]Acts 1: 1.
[6]Acts 2: 33.
[7]2 Cor. 5: 16.
[8]Heb. 1: 3.

6. The pre-existence. Paul and John represent Christ as existing before he lived on earth. John says that he was in the beginning with God.[1] He represents Jesus as saying: "Before Abraham was born, I am,"[2] and, "Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."[3] Paul says that he existed in the form of God and on an equality with God.[4] Peter's statements in 1 Peter 1: 11, 20 are best interpreted to mean pre-existence.

Now these writers probably did not begin with the idea of the pre-existence and go from that to the earthly life. They probably began with the glorified Christ as they knew him in their own experiences and went from that to the idea of his pre-existence. His eternal existence was necessary to explain his redeeming power.

Certainly they did not conceive of this pre-existence simply as an ideal pre-existence; that is, that Christ pre-existed in the mind and purpose of God. This evidently was not Paul's thought, for he says that this pre-existent Christ emptied himself in becoming man. Paul's thought, then, was that his becoming man was by the act of his own will, which would have been impossible had he been thinking of him as pre-existing only in the mind and purpose of God. With this agrees John's statement in John 1: 14 when he says that the Word became flesh. The Christ of the New Testament is not a man deified by his zealous disciples, but the eternal Son of God who voluntarily became man to redeem lost humanity.

7. Jesus as Savior. The center of the New Testament doctrine of Christ is the experience of the New Testament Christians of his saving power and their realization of his spiritual lordship in their lives. The motive lying back of their exaltation of him was a religious and practical motive, not a speculative one. As a matter of fact, they do not seem to be conscious that they are deal-

[1]John 1: 1. [2]John 8: 58. [3]John 17: 5. [4]Phil. 2: 6.

ing with a problem of thought; they are recording what they know from experience. They are telling what they have seen and heard. They do not argue; they bear witness.

The Gospels present Jesus as Savior. The angel announced to Joseph that he should be called Jesus, because he should save his people from their sins.[1] An angel also announced to the shepherds that there was born to them a Savior, Christ the Lord.[2] Jesus said that the Son of Man was come to seek and to save that which was lost.[3] He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many.[4] His blood was shed for many for the remission of sins.[5]

In the fourth Gospel he is the Lamb of God that bears away the sin of the world.[6] The Son of man was to be lifted on the cross that whosoever believes on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.[7] God gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believes in him should have everlasting life.[8] He that believes on him is not condemned.[9] He that believes on the Son has everlasting life.[10] To know God and Jesus Christ whom he sent is eternal life.[11] The purpose of the writer was that men should believe on him as the Christ and by believing in him have eternal life.[12]

In Acts he is presented as the only Savior. There is no other name given under heaven whereby men must be saved.[13] Peter tells Cornelius and his household that all the prophets bear witness to him that through his name every one that believes shall receive remission of sins.[14] Paul preaches that by him every one that believes is justified from all things from which men could not be justified by the law of Moses.[15] When the jailer asked what to do to be saved, Paul and Silas said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved."[16]

[1]Matt. 1: 21. [2]Luke 2: 11. [3]Luke 19: 10. [4]Mark 10: 45. [5]Matt. 26: 28. [6]1: 29. [7]3: 14, 15. [8]3: 16. [9]3: 18. [10]3: 36. [11]17: 3. [12]20: 31. [13]4: 12. [14]10: 43. [15]13: 39. [16]16: 31.

Paul tells us in Rom. 1: 16 that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes, to the Jew first and also the Greek. We can find what he means by the gospel by turning to 1 Cor. 15: 1ff. He says there that he preached the gospel, and when he tells what he preached, it was that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, that he was buried and that on the third day he rose, according to the Scriptures. He devotes a good part of the letter to the Romans and the one to the Galatians to showing how the sinner is justified by faith in Christ. To those who are in Christ there is no condemnation.[1] For the one who is in Christ there is a new creation.[2]

The realization of Christ's saving power is a matter of spiritual experience. Flesh and blood did not reveal to Peter the Messiahship of Jesus, but the Father in heaven.[3] Faith is the condition of salvation and faith is the power of spiritual appreciation and appropriation. One of Paul's favorite expressions is "in Christ." It is in union with him that we are justified, regenerated, given eternal life.

8. Jesus as Lord. Jesus is also Lord. He is Lord by virtue of the fact that he is Savior. His saving a man gives him a moral mastery of that man's life. In fact, a man is not saved unless God in Christ masters him.

In the synoptic Gospels Christ makes claims that no other man ever made. If men are to be his disciples, they must deny themselves, take up the cross and follow him.[4] One needs to count the cost before becoming a disciple, for he may afterward find the conditions more than he can meet. He must forsake all, if he would be a disciple.[5] He told the rich young ruler that he must sell all and give to the poor, then follow him.[6] One must not look back, must not return to bury the dead, nor go back to tell his loved ones good-bye.[7] One must

[1]Rom. 8: 1. [2]2 Cor. 5: 17. [3]Matt. 16: 17. [4]Mark 8: 34. [5]Luke 14: 33. [6]Luke 18: 22. [7]Luke 9: 59-62.

hate father, mother, brothers, sisters, houses, lands, yea his own life, to be a disciple of Jesus.[1] His mother, brothers, sisters are those who do the will of God. One must be converted and become as a little child,[2] must take his yoke and learn of him.[3] One who obeys his teachings builds on the solid rock, while the one who does not practice what Jesus teaches builds on a foundation of sand.[4] Jesus claims to have a knowledge of God that no other has and to be the only mediator of that knowledge to men. He mediates that knowledge to whom he wills.[5]

He claims to be the arbiter of the destinies of men. His gospel is to be preached to all men.[6] He is to return in glory and power and judge the nations, separating the righteous from the wicked.[7]

These claims would be preposterous on the part of any man, however great a man, unless he were more than man. He demands that men put him first, ahead of family, friends, worldly prosperity or life itself.

In the Acts the ascended Jesus is regarded as both Lord and Christ.[8] He is at the right hand of God and Stephen prays to him.[9]

In the fourth Gospel he is the only begotten Son of God. All judgment is committed to him.[10] He is the resurrection and the life.[11] Faith in him brings eternal life.[12] All should honor the Son as they honor the Father.[13]

Paul regards him as Lord in the absolute sense of the word. He is the one and only Lord.[14] In his resurrection he is instated in a position of power corresponding with his divine nature.[15] He is the last Adam, the head of a new spiritual humanity.[16] He is given a name which is above every name that in the name of Jesus every knee

[1]Luke 14: 26.
[2]Matt. 18: 3.
[3]Matt. 11: 29.
[4]Matt. 7: 24-27.
[5]Matt. 11: 27.
[6]Matt. 26: 13.
[7]Matt. 25: 31ff.
[8]2: 36.
[9]7: 60.
[10]5: 22.
[11]11: 25.
[12]3: 36.
[13]5: 23.
[14]1 Cor. 12: 5.
[15]Rom. 1: 4.
[16]1 Cor. 15: 45-49.

shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of the Father.[1]

This is the attitude of all the New Testament writers toward Christ. This comes out especially in the book of Revelation. When John sees him in his glory, in the first chapter, he falls at his feet as one dead. He is recognized as King of kings and Lord of lords.[2] There is a protest in the book against the worship of angels but none against the worship of Christ.

The recognition of the lordship of Jesus is a matter of spiritual discernment. Paul says that no man can call Jesus Lord except in the Holy Spirit.[3] That is to say that the recognition of the lordship of Jesus is a matter of faith. By faith we accept him as Lord of our lives. The act of faith is an act in which we trust him as Savior and at the same time submit to him as Lord.

9. The deity of Jesus. Consideration of the lordship of Jesus leads to a discussion of the deity of Christ. From the time of the New Testament, Christian people have worshiped and reverenced Jesus Christ as divine.

(1) An examination of some particular passages. Let us look back over the New Testament teaching with reference to this matter. All that has been said about his lordship and much else said previously will bear on this point. The fact that Jesus made such demands as he did is an indication that in his own mind he was more than human. His claim of unquestioning obedience and unfaltering loyalty from his disciples looks peculiar for one who was only a man. Then what shall we say of his claim that he would judge the world? Also he claimed to have power to forgive sins.[4] In the judgment men were to be condemned or approved according as they had had the right attitude toward him as represented in his people.[5] What is there about him that gives him such a vital and universal relation

[1]Phil. 2: 9-11.
[2]19: 16.
[3]1 Cor. 12: 3.
[4]Mark 2: 5.
[5]Matt. 25: 34ff.

to men that for one to minister to them is to minister to him, and to fail to minister to them is to fail to minister to him. These are some of the indications in the synoptic Gospels.

If we take now the fourth Gospel the evidence is still clearer. In the prologue[1] he is spoken of as being from the beginning (which evidently means that he is eternal *a parte ante*): as being with (face to face with) God; and as being God. He is eternal, is personally distinct from God and yet is God in his nature. The expression, "Theos en ho logos," is as accurate an expression as the author could have used for saying that the word was absolute deity in his nature, while being personally distinct from God. The author says that all things came to be through him and apart from him nothing came to be that has come to be. Here it is affirmed that he was the mediating agent in creation. It is not said that he was the absolute source of creation but rather the one through whom creation took place. But the author certainly thinks of him as being divine if he ascribes to him a creative function. He is universally the light of men. He lights every man that comes into the world. Here Christ is thought of as sustaining a universal relation to men. All light is his; all truth is his—the light of nature, of reason, of conscience. This one thus described became flesh and dwelt among men. Men saw his glory, glory as of an only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth. The author sets this one who is full of grace and truth over against Moses. The law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

This writer evidently thinks, then, of Christ as pre-temporal in his being; as divine in his nature; as creative in his relation to the universe; as sustaining universal relations to men; as coming in the flesh and manifesting the glory of God.

[1] 1: 1-18.

Another important passage is in 5:17-29. Jesus is in a controversy with the Jews about healing a man on the Sabbath. In verse 17 he says: "My Father worketh even until now, and I work." The Jews sought to kill him because they said he blasphemed in making himself equal with God. They must have understood Jesus, then, to make himself the Son of God in a unique sense. If Jesus did not mean to claim deity why did he not allay their anger by telling them that they had misunderstood his claim? But instead of this he goes on with a defense of the claim. He claims to have power to give life to men (verse 21). All judgment has been given to the Son (verse 22). All should honor the Son even as they honor the Father, and one who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father (verse 23). He then reaffirms his power to give life now to the spiritually dead (verse 25). He has authority to execute judgment because he is a son of man (verse 27). In the future he will raise all the dead physically (verse 28). Surely the author of this passage meant to ascribe absolute deity to Christ, for divine functions are claimed by him, and he is to be honored as men honor the Father. No Jew would ever have thus spoken of any one unless he had thought of that one as absolutely divine.

In another controversy with the Jews, in 8:58, Jesus said: "Before Abraham was born, I am." Again they took up stones to stone him. He has just said that Abraham saw his day and rejoiced. They said Jesus was not yet fifty years old; had he, then, seen Abraham? In answer to this statement Jesus seems to affirm that he transcends time, that he is eternal. Possibly he uses on purpose the title for Jehovah in the Old Testament.[1] The Jews seemed to catch the significance of it and took the statement to mean blasphemy.

In John 20:28, Thomas addressed Jesus as "My Lord and my God." Whatever else might be said about this state-

[1]Ex. 3:14.

ment, the significant thing is that Jesus accepted the designation. If Thomas was wrong in using such a term, why did not Jesus correct him? His acceptance of this form of address is his virtual endorsement of it.

In Paul's writings there is abundant evidence that he thought of Christ as divine. The most natural interpretation of Rom. 9:5 is that he there calls him God. This is the interpretation given by Sanday and others. He says that Christ is from the fathers as concerning the flesh; that is, on the human side of his being; while on the higher side of his being he is over all, God blessed forever. We have a similar conception in Rom. 1:4. He says there that, as concerning the flesh, on the human side of his being, he was born of the seed of David, but, according to the spirit of holiness, or spiritual side of his being, he was determined (margin R. V.), marked off, or instated in a position of power by the resurrection from the dead. That is, by the resurrection from the dead Jesus came into a position of power that belonged to him by virtue of his possessing the spirit of holiness or divine nature. It is possible that Paul means to call Christ God in Tit. 2:13, but this is more uncertain.

One of Paul's outstanding passages on Christology is Phil. 2:5-11. This will call for special attention when we come to consider the question of the self-emptying of Christ. But it is worthy of notice as bearing on our question here that he says that Christ pre-existed in the form of God and on an equality with God. By "form of God" he evidently does not mean a mere form or state of being as distinguished from the substance or reality belonging to it. For he goes on to say that Christ took on "form of a servant," being made in the likeness of men. Evidently he does not mean by this that Christ was human only in form or appearance. He means that he became a real man in nature and life. So he means by "form of God" that he was God in nature or essence of his being as well as in appearance or form. By "being on an equality with

God" he means that in some real sense he was equal with the Father. In verses 9-11 he speaks of the exaltation of Christ as a moral reward for his voluntary humiliation and death. What he says shows that he thinks of Christ as coming into a position of absolute lordship and sovereignty in relation to the whole human race. When he comes now into this position of authority and power he brings with him his glorified humanity. This exaltation comes to him because of his redemptive suffering culminating in his death. His position of sovereignty is now his achievement.

Another outstanding Christological passage in Paul's writings is Col. 1:15ff. Here he says Christ is the image of the invisible God; that is, he is such a reproduction or likeness of the God who is within himself invisible to men that this God becomes manifested or known to men. This Christ is the first-born of all creation. He occupies the position of authority and power in God's creation, subject only to the Father himself, just as the first-born son occupied such a position in the oriental household. Paul says that all things, without exception, were created in him and through him. God creates, but he creates in and through the Son, as he saves in and through the Son. God has no relations with the world, either creative or redemptive, except through Christ as the agent of his outgoing energy and power. Paul agrees with John's statement[1] in making Christ, not the absolute source, but the mediating agent, of creation. All things, he says, were created unto him. He is the goal as well as the agent of creation. It was with reference to him that all things were made. Creation finds its rationale, its ground plan, in him. He is before all things and in him all things consist. Not only is Christ the goal towards which creation moves, he is back of creation as its ground and support. All things hold together or consist in him. Then Paul turns to his more distinctly redemptive functions as distinguished from the cosmic. Two or three statements need attention.

[1]John 1: 3.

It was God's purpose that in all things he should have the pre-eminence. He is to be above all creation. According to verse 20, his reconciling work, accomplished through the blood of the cross, is in some sense universal, including things in heaven as well as things on earth.

It is difficult to see how one can read these statements of Paul and deny that Paul held, in the highest and most absolute sense, to the deity of Christ.

(2) The attitude of faith toward him. This question of the deity of Christ in the New Testament, however, does not depend on the exegesis of particular passages so much as on the whole spiritual attitude of the early Christians toward Christ. They were Jews. Strict and uncompromising monotheism had been ground into their thinking from their earliest days. It was a part of the national and religious atmosphere in which they had been born and bred. Yet their whole attitude toward Christ is one that could not be described by any other term than idolatry if Christ is not divine. They trusted, worshiped, served him as men can only trust, worship and serve God. And what is true of them is true of thousands of men and women in every generation from the New Testament age down to the present and of millions of those now living. What is that attitude? It can be summed up in the word faith. Christ is the object of faith in the New Testament. This is true in every one of its books from the synoptic Gospels on.

a. What faith is. (a) It is trust in Jesus as Savior from sin. That trust is unconditioned and unreserved abandonment of the soul to Christ. It is such trust as one can rightly exercise only toward God. Salvation from sin is the work of God. Sin is against God. God only can forgive sins. In this the critics of Jesus were right.[1] Yet Jesus claimed to forgive sins.[2] If Christ claimed to forgive sins, he was either divine or a blasphemer. To trust Christ for salvation is to trust him as God. The Son of man came to seek and to save the lost. But only God can save. Christ

[1]Mark 2: 7. [2]Mark 2: 5.

and God are one in saving. A man believes in Christ for salvation, or he believes in God as revealed in Christ. The two statements mean the same thing. Faith in Christ and faith in God are one faith, not two. God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.[1] The work of Christ in saving, then, is the work of God.

(b) It is surrender to him as Lord. Saviorhood and lordship in Christ are inseparable. New Testament faith involves a recognition of, and surrender to, the lordship of Jesus. Paul speaks of the obedience of faith.[2] Does this mean the obedience that grows out of faith or the obedience which faith is? Is faith obedience or does faith produce obedience? Whichever Paul means it is certain that as an experience faith in Christ contains as one of its elements the attitude of self-surrender. Faith is not only the receiving of Christ, it is the giving of self to Christ. This attitude is an attitude in principle of complete self-abandonment to another.

b. Results of this faith. Some object to this demand of Christianity for a complete abandonment of the soul to another on the ground that it is a degradation of one's personality; that one has no right thus to give himself up to another. This is true if that other is no other than a human being. This abandonment of soul man has no right to make to fellowman. It would in that case be a degradation of one's self. But the abandonment of the soul to Christ on the part of Christians has through all the ages justified itself in its practical results. If we apply the pragmatic test to this act of faith, it meets the test. This self-abandonment to Christ has lifted men and women up out of selfish and sordid lives into lives of sacrificial service to God and men. It has made the difference between lives that are self-centered and lives that are altruistic in outlook and activity. A life that is Christo-centric can not be self-centered. If lives of unselfish service are morally justifiable as over against

[1]2 Cor. 5: 19. [2]Rom. 1: 5.

lives that are selfish and sordid, then this attitude of self-abandonment to Christ is one that morally justifies itself.

Will some one who does not believe in the deity of Christ please tell us why it is that faith in Christ produces such a moral change in a man's life? If Christ Jesus was God incarnate, then we can understand that he had such universal relations with the human race as the creator and sustainer of its life, and particularly as the author of the moral law, that for one to come into moral and spiritual union with him through faith will bring one into a new bond of spiritual fellowship with all men. Now as a matter of simple spiritual experience, testified to by millions, faith in Jesus Christ as Savior results in a new love for all mankind. It drives out all enmity and hate. Any evangelistic preacher can tell of cases where it has united the worst of enemies and settled feuds between families that had been estranged for years. Moreover, there is nothing that will do this except the gospel of Christ. Now a simple question presses for answer: Why does faith in Jesus Christ as Savior produce this result? Does not the fact that faith produces such a result argue that Christ is a bond of spiritual union among all men? That is exactly what Paul says.[1] He breaks down the wall of enmity between Jew and Gentile. He makes brothers of all men, but the very fact that he does this argues that he is more than man, that he has universal relations to men, such as no mere man has. Why is it that Christ alone of all men can bring about such a relation among men?

To put the same thing in another way, by faith a man finds the love of God in Christ. As Paul says, the love of God has been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit whom he has given to us.[2] This took place by faith in Christ. When a man exercises faith in Christ, he finds the love of God. This is not an inference. It is a matter of immediate spiritual experience. A man knows this as immediately and certainly as he knows anything else by

[1]Eph. 2: 11-22. [2]Rom. 5: 5.

experience. It is this love of God which a man finds in Christ that causes one to love other men, all men.

But the point with which we are immediately concerned is that the fact that one finds the love of God in Christ is an evidence that Christ is divine. He is the embodiment of divine love. He is more than a messenger who tells men about the love of God. He so embodies that love that when a man is united to Christ by faith he finds the love of God. God is love.[1] When we get to one who is the embodiment in absolute fulness of that love, we have got to God.

When one comes to Christ in faith, he is conscious that he finds God. The cry of Philip has been the cry of men in all the ages: "Show us the Father and it sufficeth us."[2] And the answer of Jesus is the only answer that will satisfy the longing of the human heart: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."[3]

All the argument previously given to show that in Christ we have a genuine knowledge of God bears on this point. If in Christ we find God, then Christ must be the incarnation of God. In him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.[4] In Christ dwelt all the fulness of deity in human form. And this is not a matter of argument. It is a matter of experience. We know this to be true because in Christ we find God.

A man knows that Christ is divine just as he knows that there is a God; that is, by the perception of faith. In the same act of faith in which one knows God he also knows Christ as divine. This is true because it is in Christ that he knows God. One knows Christ and God in the same spiritual perception. He knows God and Christ, therefore, as one and inseparable. The only God we know is the God we know in Christ. The only God we will ever know is the God we know in Christ. Outside of Christ God is unknown and unknowable. Christ is not simply, then, the climax or culmination of the revelation of God. Christ

[1] 1 John 4: 8, 16.
[2] John 14: 8.
[3] John 14: 9.
[4] Col. 2: 9.

is the whole revelation of God. New Testament faith was right then when it perceived that Christ was the principle of revelation in the Old Testament as well as in the new.

This seems to be John's idea in his prologue. Christ is universally the light of men. The light of reason, nature, conscience—all light—is his. All light, all truth, all goodness are his. There is no light, truth or goodness outside of his. To put the light of reason, conscience or nature over against the light of Christ, then, is misleading. For one to say that he has the light of nature, reason, or conscience and, therefore, he does not need the light of Christ is to say that because he has a little of the light or truth of Christ, therefore he does not need any more. But because a man has a tallow dip is no reason why he should try to dispense with the sun. The light of his candle comes from the sun. So because a man has a little of the light of Christ as it comes through nature, reason or conscience, is no reason why he should say that he does not need the light of God as fully revealed in the historic Jesus and appropriated by faith. There is no rivalry between the moon and the sun. The moon only imperfectly reflects the light of the sun. So these and lesser lights are only the light of Christ as reflected in different ways to us.

Christ fills for the Christian, then, the whole sphere of God. It is only in Christ that we know God. In Christ we do know God by faith. In him we trust God, surrender to God, find God, experience his love, his redeeming grace and mercy, find the forgiveness of our sins, and the salvation which God alone can give.

It is not a question, then, between the knowledge of God as found in Christ and the knowledge of God that comes some other way. It is rather God as known in Christ or no knowledge of God at all. If men do not know God in Christ, then there is no knowledge of God.

This carries with it the further conclusion that it is not a choice inside Christian ranks between the doctrine of the

deity of Christ and some other interpretation of his person. So far as the Christian interpretation is concerned there is only one: Christ is the incarnation of God. Christ is deity incarnate. Any position that denies this is not Christian. This is not a matter of speculative conclusion. It is a matter of immediate spiritual perception. To have this doctrine faith only has to become self-conscious, has only to see what is its own meaning. To deny this is to take an anti-Christian attitude toward Christ.

II. **The two nature controversy.** After reviewing the New Testament teaching on this subject we might turn our attention to some considerations of history. This can be done only in a very snatchy and unsatisfactory way, but even this will help us in understanding the subject.

There was no question that so absorbed the minds of Christian thinkers in early church history as this one. Nor was there any subject that was so thoroughly discussed and concerning which so definite conclusions were reached. The doctrine was definitely formulated and set forth in fixed dogmas in the great creeds of the Catholic church.

The terms in which this discussion was carried on and in which the dogmas were stated were the terms of Greek philosophy. The interest was speculative as well as religious. Beginnning with the idea of substance as the controlling one the attempt was made to state the doctrine of the person of Christ in terms of human nature and a divine nature as these were related to the person.

1. A summary of views. There were seven of these views:

The first was the view of the Ebionites. They denied the reality of Christ's divine nature. He was only a man supernaturally endowed. The Holy Spirit came on him at his baptism and gave him the qualifications needed for his work.

The second was the docetic view. This denied the reality of his human nature. It held that his human body was not real, only seeming. It was based on a view of matter as

essentially evil. Since matter was evil, God could have no direct connection with it. Traces of this view are found in the New Testament. The view has affinities with gnosticism.

The third was the theory of Arius. He denied the deity of Christ. He denied also the human nature of Christ. Christ was a created being. There was a time when he was not. He was the first of all created beings. This created being was incarnated in a human body, but Jesus had no human soul. This spiritual being took the place of that. He by delegated authority and power created all other things. By way of accommodation he might be called God.

The chief opponent of Arianism was Athanasius. He contended for the consubstantiality of Christ with the Father. The doctrine of Arius was condemned at the council of Nicæa in 325 A.D., but in varying form the controversy raged long after that time.

Arianism was a doctrine in which Christians could not rest because it denied both the deity and the humanity of Christ. A kind of demi-god was not a being in whom men could rest their spiritual hopes.

The fourth view is the Apollinarian. This holds that Christ had a body and an animal soul but no human spirit. It is based on a trichotomous view of human nature. It holds that instead of the human spirit was the logos or divine nature.

The next view is the Nestorian. This holds that there was a complete human nature and a complete divine nature but denies their union in one person. It practically holds to two persons related under the bond of friendship, with a double consciousness.

The Eutychian view holds that the two natures were united into a third that was neither human nor divine. Practically it amounted to the swallowing up of the human in the divine. It, therefore, has close affinities with the docetic view.

The orthodox view adopted at the council of Chalcedon was that there were two complete natures, human and divine,

united in one person. The natures must not be confounded nor the person divided.

2. Some observations and conclusions. This hasty glimpse of these seven historic views may serve the purpose of teaching us some important lessons with regard to the method of approach and treatment in dealing with this question.

(1) The method was wrong in being too abstract and *a priori*. The facts of history and experience were too largely ignored. The effort was to take two things, substances or essences, unrelated and opposite in attributes or qualities—a human nature and a divine nature—and solve the problem as to how they could be brought together in the unity of a personal life. The effort was doomed to failure because of its own presuppositions. It failed for at least two reasons: (a) There is no such human or divine nature as was here supposed, as will be shown a little later; (b) it is not our task to determine in an *a priori* manner what could take place, but rather to examine the facts to see what has taken place.

(2) As stated above, the fundamental concept with which this method of thought operated was that of substance rather than of personality. If the person of Christ is ever understood, we must think of him in personal terms—personal life, qualities, relations, functions and powers—rather than in terms of abstract, almost material, substance. The most hopeful sign in modern philosophy and modern thought in general, is that it seems to be slowly moving in the direction of interpreting life and the world in terms of personality. Jesus Christ can be understood as a creative and redemptive personality, but not as the combination of two abstract and previously unrelated substances.

(3) But if we grant the presuppositions of this thought movement, it could have arrived at no conclusion other than it did and remain half way true to the interests of the religious life and the facts of Christianity. It seems that all

possibilities of thought were exhausted. This movement with the "orthodox" doctrine at which it arrived bears witness to the deep hold that three ideas have upon the Christian mind, even when it is not more than half Christian; namely, Christ's humanity, his deity and his undivided personality.

III. **False and inadequate modern views**. We can not even review the history of Christology after the first few Christian centuries. We will briefly consider some of the more recent positions that have exercised influence in regard to the question.

1. There is the humanitarian view. This holds that Christ is a man only. Those who hold this view are willing to allow that he was a great religious teacher, the greatest in fact the world has so far seen, a great and good man with wonderful insight into moral and spiritual truth. His doctrine of God as Father and men as brothers is the highest doctrine of God and men ever presented to the world. The miraculous element, including the view that Jesus was a supernatural being, did not come from Jesus. This was read back into the life of Jesus by an idealizing process on the part of over-enthusiastic and uncritical disciples of Jesus later on.

To get this view the New Testament record must be denied, not in part, but in toto. The New Testament knows nothing of such a Christ as this view presents. The earliest records of the New Testament do not assume this attitude toward Christ. One must go to some other source than the New Testament to get this view.

Then it does not agree with the attitude of Christian faith nor agree with the knowledge of Christ that comes from Christian experience. This is shown above. It is not necessary to repeat the argument here.

Nor does it agree with the transforming power of Christ in history. The power that Jesus Christ has exercised in lifting the fallen, transforming society, and changing the

currents of human events testifies that his power is more than human.

2. Then there is the view of Schleiermacher that Christ is a man filled with the divine presence. This view undoubtedly states a great truth, but it seems to be faulty in that it is not definite enough and that it does not go far enough. It does not recognize distinctly enough that Jesus is the Son of God in a sense in which no other man is. In the fourth Gospel Jesus is called the only begotten Son of God. His sonship to God is unique. He never puts himself in the same class with others in relation to God. Other men are only sons of God in a derivative sense, by faith in him. He is the Son of God in an absolute and underived sense. Jesus was more than a man filled with the divine presence. He was God incarnate, God personally present in the form and limits of a human life to redeem and save man.

This is seen in the miracles and teaching of Jesus in the New Testament. He does not work and teach in power and authority delegated to him but rather in power and authority that are native to his being and resident in him. This does not deny his dependence on God or his subordination to the Father. This fact is distinctly recognized in the fourth Gospel.[1] But it does mean that divine life and power were native to his being; were the constituent elements in his being, in a way that put him in a class all by himself in relation to deity.

3. Again, the deity of Christ as above set forth denies the position of Ritschl that Christ has for us the value of God but that we can not, therefore, say that he was God. He said that Christ functions as God in human life. He has for us the God value. But to go on and say that Christ was divine, God manifest in the flesh, would be to make an affirmation that would carry us into the realm of metaphysics, and metaphysics and religion must be kept separate. Religion is concerned with value judgments; that

[1] 5: 22.

is, judgments that affirm what a thing means for us. It does not have to do with theoretrical judgments. We can not know as to what things are in themselves. We can only know phenomena or manifestations. In this way Ritschl thought to preserve religion and avoid conflict with science.

But we can not affirm that Christ has the value of God without going on to affirm also that he is God. Only God can do the work of God. If Christ functions as God in human life, he must be God in human flesh. To say that we may enjoy the work of Christ as God in human life and then deny to us the right to say that he is God is to ask us to cease to think. We can not thus ask the reason of man to commit suicide. Our position is rather that we know that Christ is the embodiment of the divine life because he does function as God in human life. He does for man what God alone can do. Therefore we know that he is the manifestation of God. That which functions as God must belong on the divine side of reality.

IV. **The mystery of the incarnation.** There have been endless objections raised to this doctrine of the deity of Christ. Viewed as an incarnation of God, it is usually spoken of as a mystery. We will now give it brief consideration.

1. The mysteriousness of the incarnation no reason for rejecting. That it is mysterious we are willing to admit. But we do not have to reject it for that reason. If we accept as true only that which the human reason thoroughly comprehends, how much would we accept as true? All life is mysterious. As to understanding the processes of the incarnation, we do not have to wait to accept the fact until we understand the process. Many things one can know to be true without knowing how they are true. I can know that my hand moves at the behest of my will without understanding how it takes place. I can know that through the sense of sight I get knowledge of the external world without

knowing all about the process. I know that food eaten, assimilated and digested sustains my bodily life, but I do not know all about how it takes place.

A better illustration still. I know that my mind and my body are vitally related, that my mind inhabits, controls, directs the movements of my body, and in turn is affected by the condition of my body. But I do not know how. As an *a priori* question, if I had been asked if a mind or soul, with the power of thought, feeling and will such as we know the human mind to be, could animate, inhabit, direct and use a body composed of clay, I should have said no. But in spite of my failure to understand it, that very thing takes place. Life and its processes do not wait upon our understanding. If our understanding were the limit of what could come to pass, life would be circumscribed within very narrow limits. It is not a question as to what we would conclude upon *a priori* grounds could or could not take place, but rather a question as to what we are led to believe by good evidence has taken place.

The problem, so far as speculative reasoning is concerned, is the problem of the union of deity and humanity in a personal life. To this problem the New Testament does not attempt to give a speculative answer. It does not undertake to tell us how the incarnation took place. Some of its writers assert the fact. All of them imply it. But as to a speculative solution they do not even seem to recognize that there is any problem that needs solution. This is evidence that to them the deity of Christ was not an inference or logical deduction from their experience but rather a matter of direct spiritual perception as above stated. This is true of most Christians, as shown by the fact that they spontaneously assume the attitude of trust and worship toward Christ. They do not do this because someone has convinced them by argument that Christ is divine, nor because they have reasoned the matter out for themselves, but rather because when he is presented in the New Testament and in evangelical preaching, they by faith perceive him to be such.

2. The problem misconceived. Is not this problem generally misconceived? It is misconceived in that men think of deity and humanity (or a divine nature and a human nature) as two separate, self-contained entities over against each other, and then try to solve the problem as to how they could be united in a personal life. As separate entities they are thought of as having disparate attributes. But this is a misconception. Human nature is no such self-contained entity. What is man apart from God? Nothing. Such a human nature as the speculative thinker here deals with does not exist outside of his own imagination. Outside of God man does not exist. If such a human nature as the speculative theologian here thinks of existed, a human nature which was a self-contained entity, then no doubt it would be a problem as to how God could be united to it. But as presented in the Bible man is not so conceived. Paul says that in God we live and move and have our being.[1] Theologians have presented the Biblical doctrine that man was made in the image of God as helping us to understand the incarnation. Man is like God in certain fundamental respects. This is true. But with this we need to remember the further truth here advocated that man can not exist except as God is immanent in human life to sustain that life. Human nature exists, then, only as God gives it existence by his immanent presence. It is a misconception of the problem, then, to think of a human nature as existing apart from God and then to try to see how God could come into this already existing human nature. This is the deistic way of conceiving man which we ought to leave to the eighteenth century and be done with. But there seems to be a natural proneness to this deistic way of conceiving the world and human life and it is difficult to shake ourselves loose from it. But the very fact that it is only God's presence that gives man his existence shows that this way of thinking of the matter is wrong.

[1]Acts 17: 28.

There are two things about man's religious life that confirm this view. One is man's sense of dependence on God. This is a fundamental and essential element in religion. It is not the whole of religion, as Schleirmacher defined it, but it is a consttuent element. This sense of dependece bears testimoy to the fact that man can not live without God. As the other side of the same thing, is the spontaneous mpulse to recognize God as the giver of all good and to give thanks to him for the good. He is thus recognized as being present in all life.

The other thing that confirms this view is the recognized presence of God in Christian experience. In our fellowship with God in Christ we have indisputable evidence that God is immanent in human life, and that his immanence does not destroy or subvert human nature but rather that man only comes to his true self in God.

It is true, then, as Mr. Fairbairn has showed,[1] that in the incarnation there is no problem that we do not also find in God's relation to the world in creation. As to man, God's immanence gives man his being. There is no human nature existing in separation from God. There are not two entities existing apart from each other with a gulf between to be crossed before these two entities can be united. In order for human nature to exist God must be there to sustain it.

V. **The incarnation viewed as a self-emptying.**

1. Paul's statement. This does not deny that there is a problem for thought as to how God became man in Christ. Paul states it as a self-emptying on the part of the divine.[2] This passage comes the nearest of anything in the New Testament to being a rationale of the incarnation. He says that Christ Jesus who existed in the form of God did not count this being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself. This emptying of himself was connected with, if it did not consist in, his

[1]"Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 478.
[2]Phil. 2: 5-8.

taking the form of a servant and being made in the likeness of men. With regard to this we might note:

(1) That there was a genuine limitation somehow placed upon deity.

(2) This limitation was a self-limitation. It was not a limitation imposed from without. Whatever limitations were involved in Christ's becoming man were limitations that he entered into because of his own choice.

(3) This self-limitation was for redemptive ends. The whole context shows this to be true. He became man and endured the cross for man's salvation.

(4) The motive, therefore, was love for man. Here we need to dwell upon the matter. One of the chief objections to this idea is that God could not limit himself so as to become man, as this would destroy his deity. The unchangeableness of God, it is said, would prevent his becoming man. Dr. Mullins answers this by saying that the immutability of God is to be conceived of as his moral self-consistency.[1] Whatever his love demands, that God can do. In other words the governing considerations here are moral, not metaphysical or physical. God is not the slave of his own immutability. This he would be if a moral situation arose in his universe calling for an incarnation and then he could not become incarnate. This would make God an impersonal force rather than a moral person. In thinking this matter through it must be considered in relation to the whole circle of ideas to which it belongs. It is not a bare marvel that we are talking about. It is one phase of a great redemptive transaction on God's part. The conclusions here stated are borne out not only by Paul's statement in Phil. 2:5ff, but also by the whole New Testament view of Christ's life.

2. Theories of the self-emptying. Certain theories have grown up seeking to explain this matter. They are known as the kenotic theories, from the Greek term Paul used to describe this self-emptying. But we must remember

[1]"The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression, pp. 223, 224.

that any theory must not only explain what Paul means in this passage but also must harmonize with all the facts as given in the New Testament. Especially must it harmonize with the facts of the life of Christ and with his own self-consciousness as to his life and mission.

(1) The theory of Gess and Beecher. One of these theories is that of Gess in Germany and Beecher in America. It holds that in the incarnation the Logos or second person in the trinity gave up all divine attributes and was changed into a human soul. Deity was compressed into the limits of a human life. But this would imply that he ceased to be divine and would virtually be the denial of any incarnation. It seems that it would be difficult to harmonize this theory with the consciousness on the part of Jesus of his unique relation to God and particularly his consciousness of his pre-existence.

2. The theory of Thomasius. Another theory, that of Thomasius, holds that Christ did not give up the absolute or immanent attributes but did give up the relative or transitive attributes. The absolute or immanent attributes are those that belong to God within and of himself, such as holiness, truth and love. The relative or transitive attributes are those that belong to God in his relations to creation—omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence. These last, it was held, since they were not essential to the being of God could be given up. The former could not be given up because God could not be God and give them up. Hence it was held that the Logos could give up the relative attributes without ceasing to be divine.

But it is difficult to see how deity could surrender any of its attributes. Besides, would not this imply a limitation of the knowledge and power of Jesus within purely human limits during his earthly life, which would not agree with his statements about himself? It is true that he was not omniscient. He said distinctly that there was one thing that he did not know.[1] But on the

[1]Mark 13: 32.

other hand, his knowledge transcended the limits of ordinary human knowledge. So did his power. His miracles do not seem to be wrought by the use of delegated power but by the power resident in his own being. In the case of others, when they work miracles, they do so by power temporarily conferred upon them from without. But in the case of Jesus, while the exercise of that power seems to be mediated in some way by the Holy Spirit, still his power to work miracles seems to come from the depths of his own inner being.[1]

(3) The theory of Dr. Strong. Dr. Strong holds that Christ retained the divine attributes but surrendered, during his earthly life, the independent exercise of these attributes.[2] Christ retained, according to this theory, divine power and knowledge, but there were two limitations upon his use of that knowledge and power. He exercised this knowledge and power only as it was necessary to the fulfilment of his Messianic mission. This included his obedience to God and submission in all things to the Father's will. It explains the fact that Jesus never used his divine power on his own behalf. This he steadfastly refused to do. The other qualification put upon his use of his divine knowledge and power was that this exercise of divine prerogatives was mediated to him by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit anointed him at the beginning of his ministy for his Messianic mission. In teaching in Nazareth he claimed that Isaiah's prophecy, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," was being fulfilled before their eyes.[3] He claimed to cast out demons "in the power of the Spirit."[4]

Perhaps this is as good a theory as any, if we must have a theory. Certainly the two limitations here spoken of were upon Jesus during his earthly life. Di-

[1]See Mark 5: 30 and context.
[2]"Sys. Theol.," Vol. II, p. 703. On the whole subject see Dr. Strong's treatment.
[3]Luke 4: 16ff.
[4]Matt. 12: 22ff.

vine knowledge and power were his, but they were limited within the range of his Messianic mission.

(4) Sanday's view. In view of the conclusions here reached a word might be said about the theory of Prof. Sanday. That theory is an attempt to explain the incarnation on the basis of the indwelling of the divine element in the subconscious region of Christ's personality. This is in harmony with the view of some recent psychologists that the subconscious is in general the region in human personality in which the divine operates. In agreement with this Prof. Sanday holds that the divine element in Christ's personality dwelt in the subconscious region of his personality.

On this theory it would be difficult to explain Christ's consciousness of his divine mission and of his relation to God. Besides, it is based on a wrong conception of the place of the subconscious in life in general and especially in man's religious life. The subconscious factor is not the highest factor in man's life. Nor is the divine power in Christian experience confined to the subconscious region of man's personality. If this were true, it would take the element of voluntariness and freedom out of man's life and bring it down to the level of the mechanical.

VI. **The reascent.** Over against this self-emptying of Jesus is what might be called the reascent of Jesus to the throne of power. How far the process of self-emptying went no one can tell. So far as we can tell his consciousness as a babe in the manger was not different from that of any other babe. One might be disposed on *a priori* grounds to be incredible that there was any bond of personal continuity between the babe in the manger and the pre-incarnate Christ who is presented to us by John and Paul. Or on the other hand one might be disinclined to accept the view that the babe in the manger ever ascended to the throne of power as rep-

resented by many of the New Testament writers. As a matter of fact many men do deny on such grounds both the pre-incarnate Christ and the exalted Christ. But once more let it be said that a question like this can not be settled on *a priori* grounds. On purely *a priori* grounds one might be disinclined to believe that the helpless infant in the cradle could ever become the stalwart man, strong in body, mind and soul. But we know from experience that the babe does develop into the man. And one need not deny the other development simply because it is exceptional. If there are sufficient reasons for doing so, we would be justified in accepting it as a fact although we do not know of any parallel in human experience. Jesus has never been parelleled. And there is a convincing line of evidence in the New Testament that the babe in the manger did become the Lord of glory. From the Lord of glory Paul and John went back to the pre-existent, eternal Christ. After knowing him as the Lord of glory they doubtless felt that he belonged to the eternal rather than the temporal world. And if we experience his power to give eternal life, it will not be so difficult for us to give credence to their testimony.

It is to be noted, then, that there is a personal continuity from the pre-existent Christ to the Jesus of history and from the Jesus of history to the Lord of glory. There is a descent from the throne to the manger and a reascent from the manger to the throne. Let us look at the reascent.

1. Phases of his growth.

(1) In the first place, there is the general statement as to the growth of the child Jesus. Luke tells us that he grew in wisdom and stature (or age) and in favor with God and men.[1] Here seems to be a normal human growth. There is mental development—he grew in wisdom. There is physical development—he grew in stature.

[1]Luke 2: 52.

There is religious development—he grew in favor (or grace) with God. There is social development—he grew in favor with men.

We see him as a boy in the temple at twelve years of age eager to learn. He was both hearing the rabbis and inquiring as an eager learner.[1]

(2) The author of the book of Hebrews indicates that there was a moral development on the part of Jesus. He learned obedience by the things that he suffered.[2] He was made perfect through sufferings.[3] We are inclined to explain this last expression by saying that Christ was perfected officially as our high priest. But can we separate official function so completely from personal character and mission?

(3) We do not have much data to enable us to form any very definite idea of the development of the religious life and consciousness of Jesus. We see something later on of his religious habits. He had the custom of attending the synagogue worship in Nazareth.[4] We know that he was a man of prayer.[5] He knew the Old Testament Scriptures.[6]

(4) How early there developed in Jesus a consciousness of his Messianic mission we do not know. He speaks at twelve about being about his Father's business (or in his Father's house).[7] This probably indicates that there was at that time beginning to develop in him a consciousness of a divine mission in life. Further than this we could not go.

At the time of his baptism Jesus was not only conscious of his Messiahship but doubtless, as Prof. Denney maintains,[8] he knew that he was to die, and in his baptism devoted himself to death. Whether he was conscious of either at an earlier date, we can not say. The

[1]Luke 2: 46.
[2]5: 8.
[3]2: 10.
[4]Luke 4: 16.
[5]Mark 1: 35; Luke 11: 1, *et al.*
[6]Luke 4: 17 *et al.*
[7]Luke 2: 49.
[8]"Death of Christ," p. 15ff.

Father's voice no doubt came as a testimony to him that he was the Messiah and Son of God. The coming of the Holy Spirit was to anoint him for his Messianic mission and to seal him as the sacrifice for the sins of the world. The devil's temptations have their point in the fact that Jesus is conscious of his Messiahship as the Son of God and that he is to die to win his kingdom. He tempts Jesus to use his supernatural power given him for the purpose of his Messianic mission to satisfy his personal needs. This he will not do. Then he tempts him to presume upon God's care for him and manifest his Messianic splendor by casting himself down from the temple. When Jesus refuses this, he tries to get him to take a nearer and shorter route to the winning of his kingdom than the long, tortuous way of suffering and death. This also Jesus rejects.

The baptism and temptation no doubt mark important points in the religious development of Jesus. Other points might be found, such as the transfiguration, Gethsemane and supremely the cross itself. In thinking about what these events mean to the religious life of mankind we are prone to forget that they must have meant much to Jesus himself. We are not to understand from the fact that at his baptism he was conscious of his Messiahship and knew that his Messianic mission would be consummated and fulfilled in death that, therefore, all the details of his career lay open before him. This does not seem to have been the case. This would have left no room for him to walk by faith. We find him at the great crises seeking the Father's guidance in prayer. This he did at the calling of the twelve; on the occasion of the feeding of the five thousand; at the transfiguration; in Gethsemane. No doubt, there were other elements in his prayers; but also no doubt seeking God's guidance and a knowledge of the Father's will for his life was one element.

2. The element of struggle and temptation in his development. We are not to think of the moral and religious development of Jesus as taking place without struggle and effort on his part. In this case it would not have been moral. It would have been sub-moral development on a plane of being below the moral and personal. His temptations and struggles were real. His battles with sin and evil were no sham battles. We sometimes make the mistake of thinking that there can be no temptation unless there is something base and ignoble in our lives to which temptation can appeal. But this is a mistake. This will be discussed more fully later on.

We can see in the case of Jesus that temptation appealed to that which is not wrong in itself. In the first place, the temptation appealed to his physical appetite, the desire for food. To be hungry is no sin. To satisfy the desire for food contrary to the will of God and in such a way as to manifest distrust in God is wrong. Then the devil said in substance: "You claim to trust God to take care of you. We will see. If you have such confidence in God, cast yourself down from the pinnacle of the temple and see if God will take care of you. If you are the Messiah he will let his angels bear you up and your Messianic glory will be manifested and the people will believe in you. "No," said Jesus, "you shall not put God to test in that way." To put one's self in danger just to see if God will take care of one is not faith but presumption. That would be sin. Then the devil said: "You are going to follow the long, tortuous way of suffering and death to win your kingdom. I will show you an easier and more direct way. Fall down and worship me and all the kingdoms of the world which you now behold. I will give you." This was an appeal to take the short cut to the kingdom and avoid suffering and death. This temptation came back to Jesus in different forms all through his ministry to the end. It

came when the people after the feeding of the five thousand wanted to take him by force and make him king;[1] when Peter acted as the devil's spokesman and said that Jesus should not die;[2] when in Gethsemane he shrank from the coming death on the cross.[3] It was a temptation that was constantly before him.

These temptations of Jesus appealed, then, to the desire for food, to his sense of dependence on God and his resolution to trust God even if it meant starvation, and to his natural shrinking as a man from suffering and death. In the first two it is clear that the temptation did not appeal to that which was evil in itself. Possibly in the third case it is not so clear. But is it wrong to shrink from suffering? No. We can make this clear to ourselves by another question. Does suffering within itself have any merit? Does the man who lacerates himself, who starves his body, who goes on long pilgrimages that necessitate privations and hardships, who even seeks martyrdom for its own sake—does such a man make himself more righteous, more godlike? No, emphatically not. It was not wrong, then, for Jesus to shrink from suffering and death up to a certain point. That point was the point where it became clear that suffering and death were necessary to his obedience to God, the fulfilment of his Messianic mission and his service to humanity. Beyond that point Jesus did not go. When it became clear that death was the Father's will for him, his own will did not waver, but without hesitation he chose death.

3. The supreme struggle. Jesus achieved his moral and spiritual supremacy, then, through struggle. The culmination came in the final struggle of death itself. By this final and supreme sacrifice he achieved his final and supreme victory over sin. This victory manifested itself in the resurrection. He arose victorious over death because he had conquered sin. Death came as the re-

[1]John 6: 15. [2]Matt. 16: 22. [3]Mark 14: 32ff.

sult and penalty of sin; the sting of death is sin. When the sting of death had been extracted, his power over Jesus was broken. So that Peter says, "It was impossible that he should be holden of it."[1] He came forth victorious over death because he was victorious over sin. His victory over sin he won by a supreme struggle, by unswerving devotion to the will of God in his Messianic mission which led to the cross.

4. Objections to the idea of growth in Jesus.

(1) Some one may raise the objection here that growth in Jesus, especially moral and spiritual growth, is inconsistent with his sinlessness. But this objection is based on a misconception. His development was not development out of a sinful into a sinless life, but it was the development of a sinless life from one stage of growth to another. Sin is not necessary to growth; sin is the thing that hinders growth. That is the reason that we do not develop in the moral and spiritual life as we should. Sin shackles us. It prevents development. Jesus was always true to the will of God. From the ideal of right he never wavered. But what God expects of a child and what God expects of a man are not the same. What God expects of us is relative also to our mission. Jesus always measured up to what God expected of one at his age, station of life, mission, etc. But obedience now calls perhaps for obedience in a more difficult situation tomorrow. Victory to-day does not exempt from struggle tomorrow. It only invites the devil to send a more fierce and subtle temptation tomorrow. And in the case of Jesus he did not fail to do this. But in his struggles and temptations Jesus went from victory to victory until in death and resurrection his victory became final and complete.

(2) Again, it may be objected that this conception of the moral and spiritual growth of Jesus is inconsistent with his deity. But this also is a misconception. As we

[1]Acts 2: 24.

have just seen, the growth of Jesus is a testimony to his sinlessness rather than against it. On the other hand, the sinlessness of Jesus is based on his deity. The guarantee of the sinless development of Jesus is found in the absolute immanence of God in his life. The deity and humanity of Jesus are not two incompatible and mutually exclusive things which we are to try to find some means of getting together in a personal life. The deity of Jesus rather expresses itself in and through his sinless humanity. He is not less human because divine, but more. Humanity can find its completeness only in God. The fulness of the divine immanence in Jesus was the basis and guarantee of his sinlessness and hence of his unhindered growth as a man.

5. Dorner's theory of a gradual incarnation. Dorner's theory of a gradual incarnation is now pretty generally rejected. It seems that he held that the incarnation was a process, that the divine nature was imparted to Christ in proportion as his moral nature was developed and as the human was capable of appropriating the divine. While this theory is not a true statement of the matter, it was a worthy attempt to account for the growth of Jesus. And any theory that does not give full recognition to his development is not true to the New Testament and should be unhesitatingly rejected.

6. Jesus the supreme example of self-realization through self-sacrifice. Jesus' life is the supreme example of the law that one shall save his life by losing it. He found himself by giving himself completely to the will of God in service to others. This law ran through his whole life, but we see it supremely in his death. In the last great moral struggle he gave himself without abandon to the will of God and died for a sinful world. In so doing he won his supreme victory, made his final and complete redemptive achievement. It was a victory over both sin and death. It issued in resurrection from the dead. And his resurrection was his birth to a

higher plane of existence. His death was his glorification. In his resurrection he was exalted, exalted above all limitations of space and time, of moral and spiritual incompleteness and struggle. He was, therefore, exalted to the throne of authority and power in God's universe. He sat down at the right hand of God, there to await until all his enemies are put beneath his feet.

7. Scriptures setting forth the exaltation of Jesus. This process of development and self-realization came to its culmination, then, in the exaltation. Let us look at some specific New Testament passages on this matter. One is a statement from Matthew in which Jesus is represented as saying, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth."[1] After giving to his disciples the great commission on this basis (notice the "therefore" of verse 19) he says again, "And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."[2] This is a post-resurrection statement of Jesus. Notice the universal sweep of the authority here claimed as given him. It is authority that came to be his. Evidently it is authority given to him in the resurrection. It represents his supreme victory over sin and death. Then he promises his spiritual omnipresence with his people as they carry out his command. In a pre-resurrection statement he promises to be in their midst whenever two or three are gathered in his name.[3] Evidently Jesus is looking forward to his post-resurrection state and relation to his disciples in this promise.

Another significant statement is found in Acts 2: 36. Peter says, "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God hath made him, both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified." Peter is here explaining to his hearers the significance of what has just taken place on the day of Pentecost. He explains that the Holy Spirit has been poured out by the risen and exalted Christ. In fulfilment of Ps. 110: 1 God has raised Jesus

[1]Matt. 28: 18. [2]Matt. 28: 20. [3]Matt. 18: 20.

from the dead and exalted him to a position of authority and power at his right hand. Jesus who has been thus exalted, having received from the Father the promised Holy Spirit, has poured forth this which they now see and hear. Then he says that the significance of the whole thing, so far as Jesus is concerned, is that God has made this Jesus whom they have crucified both Lord and Christ. God did this in the resurrection and ascension. This is evidenced by the coming of the Holy Spirit.

What does he mean when he says that God has made Jesus both Lord and Christ? The name Jesus denotes the person whom they have known as living in their midst and whom they have put to death. Now Peter announces to them the startling fact that God has reversed their judgment of condemnation upon Jesus and exalted him to a position of authority and power that rightly belongs to him as Lord and Christ. The position he occupied before in their midst was not the position that was rightfully his. He was present as one limited in power, as one characterized by humility, even by weakness as shown in his being put to a shameful death. This position is his no more. God has exalted him. God has clothed him with universal authority and power. This power is spiritual in its nature as shown by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. It is moral, not physical or military, in character. That is guaranteed in the fact that it is the same Jesus whom they had known and who had died rather than allow his disciples to use force in defending him or rather than call upon supernatural spiritual power as represented in the angels to defend him.

The book of Acts is written to set forth the activity of this exalted Christ. Luke's first treatise was about what Jesus began to do and teach, implying that this one is about what Jesus continues to do and teach.[1] The

[1]Acts 1: 1.

program of the risen Christ is set forth in Acts 1: 8. The rest of the book is to show how the evangelistic and missionary activity of the early disciples was the carrying out of this program as the ascended Christ worked by his Spirit through his people. From Pentecost on in the New Testament, the presence and activity of the Spirit are always regarded as the spiritual presence and activity of the glorified Jesus. By his Spirit he is present with his people and works in and through them to establish his kingdom on earth.

Does not Paul in Rom. 1: 4 mean the same thing as Peter in Acts 2: 36? Not simply, as the translations would indicate, that Jesus by the resurrection was declared or demonstrated to be the Son of God; but rather that God in the resurrection instated Jesus in a position of power that was in accordance with his higher spiritual nature (according to the spirit of holiness). He has just indicated that on the human side (according to the flesh) he was born of the seed of David. But the position that he occupied while living among men on earth did not correspond to his higher nature, the spirit of holiness. But when God raised him from the dead he brought him into a position of power that corresponded to his higher nature. During his earthly life his higher nature was limited, cramped, one might say, in a state or condition of humiliation into which he voluntarily came for man's redemption. The resurrection was his release. It was his emancipation day. The limits were removed. The everlasting doors were lifted up and the King of glory marched to his throne. This interpretation is favored by the context and fits admirably in with the conception set forth by Paul in other places, and by the whole New Testament concerning the glorified Christ.

Essentially the same view is involved in what Paul says in 1 Cor. 15: 20-28. Christ is the first fruits from the dead. Having risen from the dead he now reigns at

the right hand of God. There he will remain until he has abolished all rule and authority and power. That is, every rival or opposing power in the universe will be subdued. The climax of this conquering reign will come when Christ comes again to raise the bodies of his people from the dead. All things will then have been subdued by Christ excepting God alone who has subjected all things unto Christ.

Perhaps the most outstanding passage in the New Testament on this question is Phil. 2: 9-11. Here Paul says that God highly exalted Christ, and gave unto him the name which is above every name. He has the supreme place in the universe of God. Every knee is to bow to him, of things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth. Every tongue shall confess that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father. This absolute lordship comes to Christ as a moral reward for his voluntary humiliation and death. Because he emptied himself, God exalted him. The idea we tried to express above by saying that Christ won his supreme victory in submission to death.

In the book of Revelation John records his vision of the glorified Christ in the first chapter.[1] He appears in his majesty and power. His feet that had been pierced are now feet of burnished brass. The strength of the sun is in his countenance. He holds the messengers of the churches in his hands and walks in majesty among the churches. A sharp two-edged sword proceeds out of his mouth. The Son of God goes forth to war. The book of Revelation gives us a view of the war that he conducts against darkness and sin. That war never ceases until sin is vanquished and righteousness and truth rule in God's world.

It would be interesting to notice how this thought of the exalted Christ is treated in the book of Hebrews and other places in the New Testament. But these passages

[1]Vs. 10-20.

are sufficient to show that the thought is fundamental in the thought of New Testament writers. Christianity is not a religion that looks back simply to the historical Christ. It looks up to the glorified Christ and worships him.

8. The significance of the exaltation. This matter, however, needs a further word. Just what took place in this exaltation? What did it signify for the inner life of Jesus? To this question we can not give a full answer. In the nature of the case we can not know fully. We are given some glimpses of insight into the matter.

But that the death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus did have significance for his inner life goes without saying. Enough is said in the New Testament to justify us in saying that in his glorification the limitations into which he came in becoming incarnate were removed. In his glorification he rose above the limitations of time and space. He came back into the state of glory that he had with the Father before the world was.[1] His limitations of knowledge and power were removed. He is now spiritually omnipresent.[2] His spiritual power and omnipresence can be tested out in experience and have been myriads of times. Every time a sinner turns to him in penitence and finds in him the forgiveness of sins, moral transformation, victory over the power of sin, he realizes the moral omnipotence of Jesus. There is done for him only that which God can do. Again, he is the unseen but universal Companion of his people. As they go out to proclaim the good news of salvation in his name and to extend his kingdom in the world, they realize his presence with them in fulfilment of his promise; and in that presence they find their joy and inspiration in his service.

But in saying that he came back into the position of glory that was his in the pre-incarnate state, we must

[1]John 17: 5. [2]Matt. 18: 20; 28: 20.

remember that there was a difference. Two phases of that difference we may note. In the first place, as already discussed, his glory and power are now the reward for his voluntary humiliation. His exaltation now represents also his moral achievement. He won his position. He came to it by his fidelity to the will of God and his own mission on behalf of sinful men. This carries with it the other thing, namely, that he was glorified not simply as divine but as human also. It was the Son of man that Stephen saw standing at the right hand of God. It was one like unto a Son of man that John saw clothed with priestly raiment in Rev. 1. When he went back to the glory world, he carried with him the human nature that he had assumed. In him humanity was glorified. In him humanity sat down on the throne of the universe. Our elder brother is now King of kings and Lord of lords. His destiny is ours. His victory is ours. With him we shall reign. He entered as our forerunner within the veil. Following him we shall enter and sit down with him on his throne.

CHAPTER II

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF GOD

I. Some preliminary considerations.
  1. Importance of the conception.
  2. The effort to define the conception.
  3. Factors in determining our conception of God.
    (1) The revelation of God to Israel.
    (2) The revelation in Christ.
    (3) Our fellowship with God in Christ.
    (4) The reason of man.
  4. The attributes of God.
    (1) Definition.
    (2) Some difficulties.
      a. How much to include.
      b. Classification.
      c. Tendency to treat as independent entities.

II. The personality and spirituality of God.
  1. Is God a person?
    (1) Definition.
      a. Intelligence.
      b. Self-determination.
      c. Moral consciousness.
    (2) Reasons for holding.
      a. Personality in God necessary to explain personality in man.
      b. Denial of personality in God takes meaning out of religion.
      c. Old Testament conception personal.
      d. Revelation in Christ guarantees personality of God.
      e. Christian experience implies personality.
    (3) Pantheistic objection.
      a. Holds that infinity excludes personality.

b. Answer:
(a) Based on false conception of infinity of God.
(b) World is dependent on God, but distinct from him.
(c) Bearing of the doctrine of the Trinity.

2. God is spirit.
(1) Meaning of the statement.
(2) Reasons for holding.
(3) Difficulties.

3. Relation of personality and spirituality.

III. The moral nature of God.

1. Righteousness.
(1) Meaning of righteousness in God.
(2) God's righteousness in relation to man.
a. Demands righteousness in man. This is shown in:
(a) Conscience.
(b) Moral order of the world.
(c) Scriptures.
(d) Character of Jesus.
b. Condemns sin in man.
c. Moves God to save man.

2. Love.
(1) The nature and meaning of divine love.
a. Rational, benevolent, sacrificial.
b. Righteous.
c. Gives self.
d. Demand's man's love.
(2) Love the nature of God.
a. Not accidental or incidental.
b. Creation an act of love.
c. Relation to doctrine of the Trinity.

3. Holiness.
(1) Original meaning of term.
(2) Ethical idea developed.
(3) Includes severity and grace.
(4) Means moral perfection.
(5) Imitable by man.

4. Relation of moral attributes to one another.
(1) Relation of holiness to other moral attributes.
(2) Righteousness and love.

IV. The absoluteness of God.

1. Meaning of the term.
2. Some immediate inferences.
(1) Self-existence.
(2) Unity and supremacy.

3. The absoluteness of God in relation to the world order.
   (1) His presence in the world order.
      a. Omnipresence.
      b. Eternity.
      c. Immensity.
   (2) His knowledge of the world order—omniscience.
      a. God's knowledge not limited by time.
      b. His knowledge not limited by space.
      c. His knowledge not the result of inference.
      d. He foreknows man's free acts.
      e. He knows each event of the world order in relation to all other events of that order.
      f. All truth and all intelligence grounded in God.
   (3) His power over the world order—omnipotence.
      a. Omnipotence defined.
      b. Does not interfere with freedom of man.

I. **Some preliminary considerations.**

1. Importance of the conception. The central idea in religion is the idea of God. The character of any religion is determined more by its conception of God than by any other conception. What does God do for man? What does he require of man in the way of worship and service? What is the character of God? These questions are fundamental in any religion, and the answers to them will determine largely all other features of the religion. Hence no doctrine is of more importance in theology than the doctrine of God.

2. The effort to define the conception. Some theologians begin their discussion of the doctrine of God by giving a definition of God. Often a brief definition of an idea with which we are dealing is a great convenience in handling the idea. But here it is of doubtful value. If the definition is made brief enough to be a help in handling the idea, it will lack either comprehensiveness or fulness. On the other hand, if the definition is given comprehensiveness and fulness, it will be too lengthy to be of any practical value in handling the idea or tends to become a mere description rather than a scientific definition. It is perhaps better, therefore, to let the

whole treatment of the doctrine constitute our definition than to undertake a formal definition.

3. Factors in determining our conception of God. The question as to whether or not God can be known has already been discussed. But perhaps it would help us to clarify our conceptions if a word should be said here about how our doctrine of God is to be determined. In determining our doctrine of God we recognize the following factors:

(1) The revelation of God to Israel as given in the Old Testament Scriptures. The fundamental conception of the Old Testament is the conception of God and his self-revelation to man. The doctrine of God is one of the most highly developed doctrines of the Old Testament. This revelation of God in the Old Testament gives every evidence of being a genuine revelation of God.

(2) We recognize also the completion of this Old Testament revelation in Jesus Christ. This revelation of God in Christ is central and final for our doctrine of God. The record of this we have in the New Testament. No man can know God except the one to whom Jesus wills to reveal him.[1] He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.[2] Any conception of God that will not square with the character, work and teachings of Christ is to be unhesitatingly rejected. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the ultimate religious reality for an enlightened religious consciousness. Any thought of God that does not agree with the revelation of God in Christ is darkness rather than light.

(3) A third factor, not separable from the former, but in a measure distinct, is our fellowship with God in Christ. This is a factor in the New Testament doctrine of God. It also comes to those to-day who know God in Christ. Without this it is impossible to interpret the New Testament doctrine of God aright. This exper-

[1]Matt. 11: 27. [2]John 14: 9.

ience of fellowship with God throws a flood of light upon the New Testament teaching about God.

(4) Another factor in shaping our doctrine of God is the reason of man. We are to bring our doctrine of God, so far as possible to finite minds, into consistency with itself and with our other knowledge. By the aid of our reason and an enlightened conscience we will clarify our thoughts and bring them to consistency and completeness.

4. The attributes of God.

(1) Definition. Those qualities or characteristics of the divine Being by virtue of which he is distinguished from all created beings and without which he would not be worthy of the worship and service of man are usually spoken of as the attributes of God. There are certain characteristics that mark each class of beings as belonging to that class and which distinguish it from all other classes of beings. There are certain qualities that mark matter as matter, living things as living, vegetation as distinct from animal, animal as distinct from vegetable, human as distinct from all below the human. So there are certain qualities or characteristics that belong to God as God, that distinguish him from all other beings. It is these qualities or characteristics that we mean by the attributes of God.

(2) Some difficulties. In discussing the attributes of God, there are certain difficult questions that meet us.

a. One is the question of knowing just how much to include under the attributes. Some discuss spirituality, personality, life, and sometimes other qualities under other heads, while others include these among the attributes. If we are to consider as attributes of God all the distinguishing qualities of his being, then there seems to be no reason why these should not be included. The place where there would probably be most doubt would be with reference to personality, since personality is a mark common to God and man. Yet if we re-

member that perfect personality belongs only to God, then it seems that this might be included too. Perfect personality distinguishes God from man as much as does perfect intelligence, or omniscience.

b. Another question that causes difficulty is the question of the classification of the attributes. One method is to classify them as absolute or immanent on the one hand, and relative or transitive on the other hand. By the absolute or immanent is meant those that belong to God in his eternal being irrespective of his relations to creation; by the relative or transitive is meant those that belong to God in his relations to creation. This is a distinction which it is difficult to carry through and at times becomes rather artificial and arbitrary. For instance, Dr. Strong, in attempting to carry through the distinction, first treats truth, love and holiness as immanent attributes and then as relative.[1] A more convenient method, but one not altogether satisfactory, is to classify the attributes as natural and moral. By the natural is meant those that do not have reference in any particular way to the moral character of God, while the moral attributes are the qualities that mark God as ethical in character. The trouble about this classification is that it is likely to make the impression that in some relations or activities God is non-moral and that the moral qualities are not his by nature but are accidental or incidental to his being.

c. Another trouble that arises in discussing the attributes of God is the tendency to think of the attributes as entities having an existence relatively independent of God, and sometimes as being inconsistent with one another, if not in actual antagonism. Doubtless one reason for this is that in theological treatises we are introduced to a long line of "attributes" and each is discussed as if it were a kind of independent reality.

[1] "Sys. Theol.," Vol. I, p. 260ff.

Because of these difficulties, we will undertake to present what is usually discussed under the head of the attributes of God in slightly different form.

II. **The personality and spirituality of God.** If we would get a true conception of God, there are two ideas that we must get a firm grasp on—the personality and spirituality of God. These ideas are so closely related that we consider them together.

1. Is God a person?

(1) What is meant by personality? It is usually said that a person is a being who has the powers of self-consciousness and self-determination. Perhaps this is hardly inclusive enough. Let us add to this another mark and say that the marks of personality are three: intelligence, particularly in the form of self-consciousness; self-determination; and moral consciousness.

Intelligence is a mark of personality. A person is one who knows the world around him and particularly who knows himself in relation to that world and to other persons. It is the power to say, "I am I" as over against all other forms of reality in the world. It is the power to know oneself as the abiding subject of all one's various experiences and to distinguish oneself from those experiences. I am not my sensibilities or feelings or thoughts. I am more than any or all of these together. Back of the changing experiences is the abiding self.

A donkey may have consciousness but not self-consciousness. If a donkey should ever say to himself "I am a donkey," he would that moment cease to be a donkey.

Another mark of personality is self-determination. A person may be influenced from without, but the determining factor in shaping life and destiny is from within. Others may influence us; we determine ourselves. This means that a person has the power of looking ahead and of choosing one's own course. After hav-

ing chosen an end, one has the power of directing one's energies and efforts to the accomplishment of the chosen end.

The third mark of personality is moral consciousness; that is, a person is conscious of the distinction between right and wrong, and of obligation to do the right and avoid the wrong. A being with the power of self-consciousness and self-determination but without a moral consciousness would not be a person in the full sense of the term. In fact it is doubtful if self-consciousness and self-determination would mean anything apart from a consciousness of right and wrong. At least self-consciousness and self-determination come to their most distinctive form in relation to the idea of right and wrong. A non-moral person would be little if anything more than a thinking machine.

The question of the personality of God reduces itself, then, to the question: Is God self-conscious intelligence; is he self-determining; does he know and have regard to moral distinctions? There is only one answer to this question—an unhesitating affirmative. God is the only being who has perfect self-consciousness, perfect self-determination and a perfect moral consciousness. He is, therefore, the only perfect personality. Man is only partially self-conscious. He knows and understands himself only to a small degree. He is only to a limited extent self-determining. His power of self-determination is limited by the world around him, by his own nature and limited powers. His freedom is only a partial freedom. His moral consciousness is very imperfect. His conceptions of right and wrong are often blurred and indistinct. His sense of moral obligation is many times dulled. In view of these facts some one has said that man is a candidate for personality rather than a person. His personality is, or should be at least, a developing personality. God's personality is eternally complete. He knows himself perfectly in relation to all

things that are; he is completely self-determining—he depends on nothing outside of himself for what he is and does; his moral consciousness is perfect, for his own moral nature is the ground of the distinction between right and wrong and the ground of all moral obligation in himself and in others.

(2) What reasons do we have for holding to the personality of God?

a. In the first place, personality in God is necessary to account for personality in man. If the world-ground is impersonal, then the personality of man has no explanation; the stream rises higher than its source. But if God is a person we can account for man's personality as being the creation of God who has made man in his own image. But if God is not a person, man's personal qualities are without explanation.

Moreover, any system of thought that denies personality in God will ultimately, as a logical necessity, make man's personal life to be only a bubble appearing for a moment on the surface of the sea of being and then reabsorbed in the sea. Personality in God and in man stand or fall together. There is no place for any permanent personal values in a world which is impersonally grounded.

b. In the second place, if God is not a person, all meaning is taken out of the religious life of man. Religion is one of the most characteristic things about man's life. To do away with the personality of God in our thought of him is not to explain religion but to explain it away. It has been truly said that religion is carried on in personal terms. If God is not a person, then the most essential ideas and activities of the religious life are without meaning. What would sin, repentance, faith, prayer mean except in relation to a personal God? Sin is against a person. Repentance is toward a person. Faith is trust in a person. Prayer is communion with

a person. Religion is only a superstition and a sham if God is not a person.

c. The Old Testament conception of God is clearly personal. He feels, speaks, thinks. To the prophets he was the sovereign ruler of the world.

d. But the final guarantee of the personality of God is found in the revelation of God in Christ. Christ thinks of God as a person. To Jesus God was the loving Father who watches over his children with tender care. He rules the world in love. Not a sparrow falls to the ground without his notice.

The qualities emphasized in Christ's revelation of God are personal qualities. They are supremely love and righteousness. The coming of Christ and his death for mankind are the revelation of the love of God. The dominant qualities in the character of Jesus are the supreme attributes of God. Jesus is himself the embodiment of the life of God. The Christian revelation is founded on the idea of the personality of God.

e. Moreover, in Christian experience when the Christian repents toward God and exercises faith in Christ, he gets a personal response. He experiences the forgiveness of sins, moral transformation, the remaking of his own personality in the moral image of Christ. He has personal communion with the living God as revealed in Christ. This experience of fellowship with God leaves no more doubt in his mind about the personality of God than he has about the personality of his closest earthly friend.

(3) The great objection to the personality of God is based on a pantheistic philosophy. It insists on the infinity of God and interprets that infinity to mean his all-inclusiveness. God is infinite in the sense that he includes everything in himself. There is nothing, therefore, outside of God. But personality, it is said, is necessarily limited. It belongs to the essence of personality that the person be able to distinguish himself from the

not-self. This is the meaning of self-consciousness; namely, that one be able to distinguish himself from other selves and the world around him. Where one can not do this, there can be no self-consciousness and hence no personality. In the case of the infinite being this is impossible because there are no selves, no world, outside the infinite. All things exist in the infinite as a moment or element in the infinite or absolute life.

The objection is based on a false conception of the infinity of God. It conceives the infinity of God as being, in the spatial or material sense, his all-inclusiveness. But God is not infinite in that sense. He does not include all things in himself in the sense that he is a great sack or envelope that swallows up everything. The world and finite selves are not a part of God. They are distinct from him. God is infinite (or absolute) in relation to creation in the sense that nothing exists independently of God. He is the ground and support of all else. He gives existence to all else. All else depends on him. The All is not God, even if you write it with a capital letter. Man and the world are distinct from God, but dependent on him. But God is independent. He depends on nothing outside himself. Moreover, there are no limitations except those imposed by his own nature and will. He is self-sufficient. Man is not. All God's resources of life and power are in himself.

God knows man and the world for what they are, namely, as distinct from himself but as dependent on himself. Yet to know them as dependent on himself he would have to know them as distinct from himself and himself, therefore, as distinct from them. God does distinguish, then, between himself and the world. He knows himself as distinct from the world and the world as distinct from himself. This implies self-consciousness on the part of God. The only basis on which this can be denied is the pantheistic idea that God is the infinite

sack that swallows up all else and makes everything a part of God.

Moreover, the doctrine of the trinity as presented in the New Testament helps us. Christ is presented as pre-existent and eternal. In his eternal existence he lives in fellowship with God. John says that the pre-existent Word was with God.[1] The preposition here implies intimate face-to-face fellowship between the Father and the Son. There is, then, in the eternal being of God a social life. There is mutual knowledge and fellowship among the persons of the Godhead. For this reason, some writers speak of God as being personal rather than as a person; that is, he is tri-personal rather than uni-personal.

This shows that, even if a knowledge of another than self is necessary to self-consciousness, still we have within the trinity the conditions essential to personal life, independently of God's relations to creation. It shows also how God can have knowledge of the world as dependent on himself, hence as other than himself, without being dependent on the world for his self-conscious life. So if knowing oneself as distinct from other things or selves be necessary to self-consciousness and hence to personality, we have the necessary conditions for such a self-consciousness on God's part in his relations to creation in that God knows the world and finite selves as they are; namely, as dependent on himself and hence as distinct from himself. Then as to the eternal or supratemporal life of God we have the necessary conditions in the eternal fellowship among the persons of the trinity. Hence the pantheistic objection to the personality of God does not hold.

2. God is spirit.

(1) Meaning of the statement. By this is meant that the essence of his being is spirit rather than matter. There is no material element in his being. He is not

[1]John 1: 1.

matter. He is not dependent on matter. He has no body. The only way that we can form a positive conception of the spirituality of God, one that will have concrete content, is to construe the life of God in terms of our own inner experience. We must think of God in terms of mental and moral energy and life rather than in material concepts.

(2) Reasons for holding. The Bible everywhere teaches that God is a spiritual being. The clearest expression is that of Jesus when he said "God is spirit."[1] This probably should not be translated God is a spirit, that is, an individual spiritual being, but rather God is spirit, that is, spirit forms the essence of his being. The lesson that he is teaching about spiritual worship would agree better with this translation. There is no article in the Greek and it can be translated either way.

Our fellowship with God as a matter of inner spiritual experience would also lead us to believe that God is a spiritual being. We can not see God, nor reach him through any other form of sense perception. But we can come into fellowship with God through faith. Through this spiritual experience we know God as an invisible, spiritual power operative within us.

(3) Difficulties. There are two difficulties. One is that the Bible talks about the hands, eyes, mouth, of God. We must of course understand these as expressions adapted to our human understanding. God could be revealed to us in no other terms than human terms.

The other difficulty is only another phase of this. It is the difficulty of conceiving God without reference to form or material concepts. This difficulty is met in Christ. No man has ever seen God; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him.[2] He has made God tangible and real to the thoughts and experiences of men.[3] He is the image of

[1]John 4: 24.
[2]John 1: 18.
[3]1 John 1: 1.

the invisible God.[1] The history of idolatry is a testimony to man's need of a tangible revelation of the invisible God.

The revelation of God in Christ serves the purpose, then, of revealing God as pure spirit and at the same time making him real to men.

3. Relation of personality and spirituality. These two ideas of personality and spirituality are closely related. Some people have difficulty in thinking of personality apart from physical form or space relations. But when we come to see what is involved in personality, we realize that the essence of personality is spiritual, not physical or material. Perhaps it would not be wrong, then, to say that God can be perfect personality because the essence of his being is spiritual rather than material. He transcends the limitations of our finite personalities, for one reason, because he is not limited by, or dependent on a body. Other conditions than this may be necessary to constitute the perfection of his personality, but it is difficult to see how he could be perfect in personal life if he were dependent on a body.

We might say, then, that the essence of God's being is spirit, while the form it takes is personal—personal as over against any lower form of being as impersonal.

III. **The moral nature of God.** In defining what is meant by the personality of God we included moral consciousness as an essential element in personality. This means that God is a moral being. We must look further at what is involved in the fact that God is a moral being.

In thinking about God the emphasis should be put on the moral nature or character of God rather than on his power or greatness. We will understand this all the more readily if we remember that the final revelation of God is given us in Jesus Christ. If any man would know the kind of God we serve, he can find out by considering Christ. He is the image of the invisible God. God is, therefore, like Christ. The dominant qualities in the

[1] Col. 1: 15; Heb. 1: 3.

life of Christ are the dominant qualities in the character of God.

The moral character of God is sometimes summed up in the term righteous love. Another term used in the Scriptures is holiness. We will, therefore, consider righteousness, love and holiness as terms descriptive of elements in the moral nature of God or phases of his moral character.

1. Righteousness.

(1) Meaning of righteousness in God. By the righteousness of God we mean the rectitude of his character. God's character is upright. In him is no sign or taint of evil. John expresses it by saying that God is light.[1] Whatever else this may mean, it signifies the absolute purity of God's character, his entire freedom from anything evil. But we must not think of righteousness as a merely negative quality in God. It is positive. He is not only free from evil; he is opposed to the evil. All the energy of his being is set against sin. He puts himself against sin and for the right.

To be righteous is the very nature of his being. The question has sometimes been debated whether righteousness is something pertaining to the nature of God or something affirmed by the will of God. The discussion is based on a false assumption, namely, that God's will is exercised in an arbitrary or capricious manner. There is no such will of God. God's will is the expression of the energy of his nature. His will is nothing apart from his nature, and his nature is nothing apart from his will. His being is of the nature of a righteous, moral will. When you get to moral will, you get to the central thing in the nature of God. The energy of his will is always set against the wrong and in favor of the right, because it is his nature to be righteous. What God does is right, because his nature is righetous. Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? This was not a ques-

[1] 1 John 1: 5.

tion expressing doubt, but expressing assurance. Abraham, the friend of God, could not think of Jehovah as doing anything other than right.[1] This assurance is the basis of his plea. In the case of God, as with men, conduct must conform to character. Or, to put the same thing another way, conduct reveals and expresses character. We know what a man is by what he does. The same thing is true of God.

(2) God's righteousness in relation to man. In relation to man three things need emphasis.

a. God's righteousness demands righteousness in man. This requirement expresses itself or is revealed to man in various ways. It reveals itself in the demands of conscience that man do the right. Man's conscience demands of him that he do the right and avoid the wrong. Conscience approves the right and condemns the wrong. This does not mean that conscience is infallible in its decisions as to what is right and what is wrong. But it does mean that the general demand of conscience that one do the right so far as it is known and avoid known wrong is a revelation of God's righteousness as mandatory in relation to man. It means that this demand of man's moral nature is a revelation of the righteousness of God as demanding righteousness in man. The same demand is revealed in the moral order of the world. The world viewed as a moral order, as being the sphere of the operation of moral law that condemns wrong and approves right, teaches the same lesson.

There is a still higher revelation of God's mandatory righteousness in the moral law as given in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. The ten commandments are a good example. These constitute the basis in the civilized world of moral order. In some respects we have, however, an advance in the standard of righteousness in the latter part of the Old Testament. In the ten commandments the emphasis is on the outward act.

[1]Gen. 18: 25.

There are places in the psalms and prophets where the emphasis is distinctly on the state of heart and the inner life. We have this pre-eminently when we get to the New Testament. Jesus fulfills the Old Testament law by developing its spiritual character. He shows that evil or good is a matter, first of all, of the state of heart and the motive that prompts the deed. Good examples of this are his teaching in regard to murder and adultery.[1] He also lays emphasis on the goodness of God and calls on men to be like him.[2] He sums up the law and the prophets in love to God and love to men.[3] Paul says that love is the fulfilling of the law.[4] He exalts faith, hope and love and makes love supreme.[5]

The supreme expression of the Christian ideal of goodness we have in the character of Jesus himself. He was all that he taught that men should be. He lived up to his own teaching. In him we have the complete ideal of righteousness. He is God's perfect man. He is all that God requires of man. But what he is God requires that men shall be. Nothing short of his perfect manhood will meet the requirement of the divine righteousness.

This shows that the utilitarian conception of the moral law is wrong. The distinction between right and wrong is not grounded in experience—the right being identical with the useful or that which turns out well and the wrong being identical with that which turns out badly. The distinction between right and wrong is grounded in God's nature as righteous. This gives us a moral law grounded in a transcendent and unchangeable reality.

b. God's righteousness condemns sin in man. Man universally falls short of the standard as set for him by a righteous God. There is none righteous, no not one.[6] As righteous God must condemn man's sin. The Bible

[1]Matt. 5: 17ff. [2]Matt. 5: 43ff. [3]Mark 12: 29-31. [4]Rom. 13: 10. [5]1 Cor. 13. [6]Rom. 3: 23.

all the way through represents God as set against the sin of man. He would not be righteous if he did not condemn it. Nor does this mean, as sometimes represented, that God condemns sin in the abstract, but does not condemn the sinner. Sin in the abstract does not exist except in our minds. It is sin in the concrete that God condemns. In other words, God condemns the sinner who wilfully persists in sin. There is no sin apart from a sinner who sins. God is angry with the wicked every day. Paul does not hesitate to speak of the wrath of God as revealed from heaven against the unrighteousness of men.[1] This does not mean that there is anything vindictive in God. But it does mean that God's righteousness must react against sin and condemn it. To deny this would be to say that God does not regard moral distinctions in dealing with men and that he treats the righteous and the wicked alike. This would be equivalent to saying that he is a non-moral God. If God is a moral God, if he recognizes the distinction between right and wrong, he must have a different attitude toward the righteous and the sinner. Nor does this mean that God does not love the sinner. He both loves and condemns at the same time. This is not to affirm an inconsistency in God. The inconsistency is in man. God loves man because of his worth and condemns him because of his unworthiness. Man is worth loving, but so far as he identifies himself with sin he is not worthy of being loved. He is worth saving, but not worthy of being saved. If he had not been worth saving, then God's plan to save him would have been folly. But if he had been worthy of what God did for him, then salvation would not have been a matter of grace. As sinful and unworthy God condemns man. But as a being of immeasurable worth God loves him. If God as righteous did not condemn man as sinful, then God's love to the sinful would not be grace.

[1]Rom. 1: 18.

If we would know what is the attitude of true righteousness toward sin, we can learn by looking at Jesus in his relation to sinners. He was full of compassion for sinners, but he was unsparing in his condemnation of those who persisted in wilful unbelief. To spare sin is not mercy to the sinner. The only way one can be saved from sin is, first of all, to have one's sin condemned to the fullest measure of its ill desert. To save the sinner God must, first of all, condemn the sinner in his sins. When the sinner accepts the condemnation of his sins, assumes toward his sin the same attitude of condemnation, not sparing himself in the least, then as a matter of grace he can be saved. But if one refuses to acknowledge the condemnation, then he must remain under the condemnation. All this we see in the life of Jesus. He condemned sin unsparingly. When the sinner humbly accepted this condemnation, turning in penitence from his sin, Jesus forgave him in mercy. But if the sinner refused to acknowledge the condemnation of his sin and hardened himself in sin, Jesus condemned him without mercy. There could be no mercy in the case. The sinner would not receive it. He did not see the need of it. The outstanding example of this class was the Pharisees. In his denunciation of these we see the element of severity in the character of Jesus. And the attitude of Jesus in this respect we take to be the attitude of God. If he is God's final revelation to men, then we should see, not only God's love in the mercy of Jesus to the impenitent, but also the justice of God in his condemnation of sin that leads to the salvation of the penitent and his condemnation without mercy in the case of the impenitent. This aspect of the righteousness of God is usually spoken of as his justice. This view of the righteousness of God will come under consideration again when we come to the atonement viewed as the condemnation of the world's sin in the death of Jesus on the cross and again when we come to the doom of the impenitent.

c. God's righteousness moves him to redeem the sinner from sin. There is another aspect of righteousness which has sometimes been overlooked. Punitive righteousness or justice is the phase of the subject that has been given most attention in theology, but this is not the only phase of righteousness emphasized in the Scriptures. In the psalms and some of the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, righteousness becomes a redemptive quality in God. Righteousness and redemption are shown as being almost synonymous. Especially is this true in the latter part of Isaiah.[1] Here God's redemptive activity grows out of and expresses his righteousness. Theology has often said that God saves in spite of the fact that he is righteous or just. But these Scriptures rather say that God redeems because he is righteous. His redemptive activity is the revelation and expression of his righteousness. In the New Testament we are told that God is faithful and righteous to forgive those who confess their sins.[2]

Paul tells us that in the gospel is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith.[3] Righteousness here is not an attribute of God, but it is a righteousness that comes to man from God. This righteousness is in contrast to the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold down the truth in unrighteousness.[4] This righteousness is not merely forensic or what theology has called the imputed righteousness of Christ. Paul's doctrine of justification is not merely forensic. Justification through faith in Jesus is a great moral and spiritual transaction that revolutionizes a man and makes him righteous. It is regenerative in its nature. And God makes men righteous because he is righteous. The righteous Lord loveth righteousness.[5] He hates iniquity and sin. His hatred of iniquity and sin and love for righteousness lead him

[1]See Ps. 51: 14; Isa. 41: 10; 42: 6; 45: 13; 46: 13; 51: 6; 61: 10.
[2]1 John 1: 9.
[3]Rom. 1: 17.
[4]Rom. 1: 18.
[5]Ps. 11: 7.

not only to condemn iniquity and sin, but also to deliver men from iniquity and sin and make them righteous. And so much does he love righteousness that in order to make men righteous he is willing to pay an infinite price for their deliverance from sin and salvation to a life of righteousness.

Righteousness in God, then, is something more than cold, abstract justice. This we can readily see if we remember that to be righteous involves all that we mean by goodness. The Christian ideal of goodness is more than justice. A good man is one who is charitable as well as just. He exercises mercy in his dealings with men. A man who was simply the embodiment of justice could never be the best man according to the Christian ideal of goodness. And this is because Christianity has revealed God as a God of goodness, one who is merciful and gracious as well as just. The righteousness or goodness of God, then, could not be complete if it left this element out.

2. Love.

(1) The nature and meaning of divine love. The love of God is difficult to define. This is not because it is something unknown. Many of the things we know best are most difficult to define scientifically. The great elemental forces and facts of life are difficult to define, not because they are unknown, but because they are so great and far-reaching that their limits are difficult to mark exactly. But while we cannot define with scientific precision, we can describe some of its qualities in such a way that we can know what we are talking about. We can distinguish it from other things. We will, therefore, undertake to describe some of the qualities of love as we know it in God.

a. God's love is rational, benevolent, sacrificial. Love in its true meaning is not a mere sentiment of pleasure or good feeling toward things or persons. This is a mere childish sentiment which may quickly be turned into its opposite. Nor is it a blind affection that clings

to its object "through thick and thin," irrespective of moral conditions. But love is an intelligent principle. It is, therefore, something more than mere feeling. There is, or may be at least, the element of feeling or sentiment in it, but it is something more than that. Love is not blind. That which is blind is not love; it may be sentiment or misguided affection, but not true love. The word that is usually translated love in the New Testament, used especially for the divine love, denotes a rational, intelligent principle. Love as intelligent has in it the element of wisdom. It sees and plans the best for its object.

Love is benevolent. It is a principle of good will. It wishes good to its objects. But true benevolence is not only wishing well, but also doing well to others. Love acts on behalf of others. On the natural plane God does good to all men. His blessings are universal. He sends the rain on the just and the unjust.[1] The rain and fruitful seasons are an expression of his good will to men. This general benevolence of God to all men is what we might call the divine love on its lowest plane of manifestation. We see God's love acting on our behalf especially in the redemptive work of Christ. Christ came as an expression and revelation of the love of God. God so loved that he gave. He gave the best that he had, his only begotten Son. In the Son he gave himself. He gave because it is the nature of love to give. Love gives the best. Love gives self. Love is, therefore, sacrificial. God did not give that which cost him nothing. He gave when giving cost the most.

b. God's love is righteous. It has respect to the eternal principles of righteousness in every expression of itself and in everything that it does for its object. All love's giving and receiving must be morally conditioned. The giving of self or seeking to possess another, except in accordance with principles of righteousness, may de-

[1]Matt. 5: 45.

generate into ignoble passion or base lust. Such giving and seeking is selfish and, therefore, is not love, cannot be love in the true sense of the word.

The meaning of the atonement is that God could not give himself to man in such a way as to disregard moral conditions and obligations. The integrity of God's character and of his moral government of the world must be sustained even at infinite cost to himself. He could not give himself to man, nor could he receive man into his favor without regard to moral conditions. Hence before man can be received and forgiven, he must confess and repudiate his sins.

Because of the fact that the manifestations of God's love are morally conditioned, there are what might be called grades in God's love as expressed to man, dependent on man's capacity to receive and willingness to respond to God's love. There are the manifestations of his benevolence to all men, his general provisions for their welfare. But the highest manifestation of love is in his mercy and grace. God's grace is his love going out after the unholy in character and seeking to transform them into the image of his holy character. Those who respond to his grace and yield to its transforming power come to know the blessedness of fellowship with the Holy One.

c. God's love gives self. Dr. Strong defines love as the self-imparting quality in God.[1] While perhaps not a sufficient definition, this statement brings out a true quality of love. God's love in the giving of self is limited by man's capacity to receive. But all that God gives to man is meant to be an expression of himself, so that in receiving the gift man might discern the love of God and open his heart to God himself. How tragic it is to see men constantly receiving the gifts of God and never recognizing the Giver! How infinitely patient God must be to continue to pour out his gifts upon men age after

[1] "Sys. Theol.," Vol. I, p. 263.

age, when they are so blinded by sin and sense as never to think of him! God's object is always to awaken in men the spiritual perception by which they may appreciate and receive him into their lives. In all that he gives he wants to give himself. He is the best of all gifts. But sometimes men are so taken up with the gift that they forget the Giver. When this is true the gift is not a blessing, but becomes a curse. Not that God sends it as a curse, but our lack of spiritual perception and appreciation turns his blessings into a curse. And, too, sometimes he may be able to awaken in us a sense of our need of him and an appreciation for him by withholding the things in which we are so absorbed as to forget him. Then the withholding is the greatest blessing he can bestow on us.

d. God's love demands man's love. In the Old Testament God is called a "jealous" God.[1] This means that he wants the undivided affection of his people. The relation between Jehovah and his people is compared to the relation between husband and wife and an idolatrous people who do not give Jehovah their undivided loyalty and service are called an "adulterous" people. Jesus speaks of the people of his day as an evil and adulterous generation.[2] He teaches also that men ought not to allow worldly sins and anxieties to interfere with their single-hearted devotion to God.[3]

This desire to possess the undivided love and service of his people is not a selfish desire on God's part, nor an unreasonable demand. The relation of God to man as a dependent creature gives God the right to such devotion from man. Moreover, the good of man requires that he shall render to God such devotion and service. Man needs nothing so much as he needs to give himself wholeheartedly to God. To refuse to serve God or to try to serve him with a divided heart, means man's ruin. So this requirement is truly a requirement of God's love.

[1]Ex. 20: 5. [2]Matt. 12: 39. [3]Matt. 6: 19ff.

Love seeks the highest good of the loved one. To lead man to give himself with undivided affection to God is to promote man's highest welfare. Nor is there any contradiction between the idea of God's giving himself to man and seeking the possession of man. The two go together. Each implies the other. God wins possession of man by giving himself for man and to man. It is by an impartation of himself to man that God awakens in man a desire for God. At least the awakening of the desire for God, leading man to seek God, and giving himself to man are two sides of the same transaction. God awakens a desire for himself and then meets the desire by giving himself. By giving himself he creates in man a deeper capacity for God.

We can see this if we look at it from the standpoint of man's faith. Man's faith in God is both a reception of God and giving of oneself to God. At the same time that we receive God and his grace we give ourselves to him. We yield ourselves to him and appropriate his offered gifts in one act of faith.

(2) Love the nature of God.

a. Love is not something accidental or incidental to God, but love belongs to the very nature of God. John tells us that God is love.[1] Whoever, therefore, lives in love knows God, but whoever lacks love or hates his brother does not know God.[2] Love is consequently something eternal in its nature. Because God is love and love is eternal, God's plan of salvation is eternal. He set his heart upon us before times eternal. In pursuance of his eternal plan of love, he now draws his people to him and imparts himself to them. God's purpose and plan to save are not something secondary, something that came as an afterthought after some better plan failed. Granted the fact of sin, it was morally certain that God would save, since he is the kind of God he is. There was no outward constraint placed upon him, but there was the fact of his

[1] 1 John 4: 8. [2] 1 John 4: 7ff.

own nature as love that guaranteed that he would seek by wisest and best plan to recover his creatures made in his moral and spiritual image.

b. The fact that God is love helps us to understand that creation itself, with all else that God does, is an act of love. There is nothing that God does that is inconsistent with love. Love is the motive in all that he does. He created because he loves. It is his delight to create moral and spiritual beings, to whom he can impart himself, and by imparting himself to them win them to himself and thereby make them holy and happy. All God's dealings with men are in love. In all the long, dark days of human sin and suffering God is hovering over the race, seeking to awaken in men a recognition of himself and a response to himself that will mean the eternal blessedness of men.

Creation is cast on redemption lines. We can see the world's history as the unfolding of God's providential plan of love leading to the redemption of the race only when we see the world's history from the point of view of God's coming into human history in the person of Jesus to redeem man and of our experience of his redeeming power in our lives. Even then there are many things we do not fully understand, but knowing the God of our salvation as a God of love, we can trust him with the hardest problems that come into our lives; and it is by our trust, our reliant faith in him and his goodness that our defeats are turned into victories and his redemptive plan realized in our lives. This view of human history makes it luminous with the presence of God as a God of love who is realizing his purpose in the course of human events.

c. The idea that God is love essentially and eternally is closely related to the doctrine of the trinity. God's work of creating, preserving, guiding and redeeming

the world is an expression of his love. Love is the motive behind it all and in it all. But if God is to be a God of love in his own nature, there must be social life within the Godhead. No view of God enables us to see how this can be except the Christian doctrine of the trinity. This doctrine enables us to see that the primary object of God's love is his eternal and only begotten Son. Eternally the Father's love has gone out to the Son in the Spirit, and in the Spirit the Son's love has answered to the love of the Father. In eternity the Word was with God.[1] The word translated "with" denotes intimate, face-to-face communion. The only begotten Son who declares the Father is in the bosom of the Father.[2] Certainly this denotes the most intimate union and fellowship. John puts it in the present tense, possibly to denote an eternal fact, not something that came to be during the earthly life of Jesus, but something that transcends the earthly life and makes that life in time a revelation of the eternal God in his essential nature.

All God's dealings with men are in and through Christ. In Christ the race was created; in him it is preserved; in him men are reconciled to God and redeemed; he is the goal toward which the whole creation moves; the ground plan of the universe was laid in him.[3]

It is only in Christ that men can ever realize the love of God. God's love to men is revealed only in Christ. God's love to men is only a reproduction of his eternal love to Christ the Son of his love. As long, then, as man has his back turned on Christ he can never know the love of God. But in Christ God is known as love.

3. Holiness.

The original meaning of the term translated holiness in the Old Testament seems to be impossible now to determine. There is pretty general agreement among Old Testament students to the effect that the term as used in the Old Testament did not at first

[1]John 1: 1. [2]John 1: 18. [3]Col. 1: 13ff.

possess moral significance; at least that the moral idea was not emphasized. At first, the emphasis seems to have been on the idea of the transcendence, the separateness of God. It was that quality in God which separated or distinguished him from things finite and created. This idea of transcendence or separateness from the world the term perhaps never lost. And since the term signified that in Jehovah which marked his separateness from the world, the term came to be synonymous with deity. The Holy One of Israel signified the God of Israel.[1] That the term did not necessarily convey an ethical significance is shown by the fact that things were considered holy by virtue of their separation from secular uses and consecration to the service of Jehovah: things such as the temple, the sacrifices, the Sabbath. Anything connected directly with the presence or service of Jehovah was considered holy. Jerusalem was the holy city because it was the place of Jehovah's dwelling and manifestation to his people. Since things and places do not possess ethical qualities within themselves, it is evident that the idea of holiness here is not primarily ethical, if that idea is present at all.

But the ethical idea comes to be prominent, especially in some of the psalms and the prophets. The idea of transcendence is doubtless there, but it is now his ethical transcendence. He now transcends man in ethical goodness. His ways and thoughts are not man's, but are higher than those of man.[2] The ethical transcendence of Jehovah comes out in Isa. 6. The prophet in his vision sees Jehovah on his throne, high and lifted up. The seraphim cry, "Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts." And there was something in that vision of Jehovah in his exaltation and holiness that made the prophet realize his own sinfulness and the sinfulness of the people in whose presence he lived. The holiness of Jehovah here is evidently ethical holiness or it would not have made

[1]See Davidson, "O. T. Theol.," p. 145. [2]Isa. 55: 8, 9.

the prophet realize his own ethical unfitness. And this ethical holiness of God is evidently a goodness that transcends the human, or the vision of it would not have smitten Isaiah so powerfully with a sense of his own ethical impurity.

Again, in the holiness of God, as Isaiah sees it, there was evidently the element of severity. He is immediately smitten with the sense of conviction and condemnation. He confesses himself sinful and unworthy. He sees the whole moral order of things of which he is a part to be corrupt. He lives in the midst of a people of unclean lips. Yet at the same time there is the element of mercy in this holiness. The coal from the altar removes his sin. There is healing power as well as condemning power in the vision of God's holiness. The holiness of God, therefore, includes the element of mercy or grace as well as the element of severity or justice.

The same thing is true in the New Testament. In what we call the Lord's Prayer, the first petition is that men may regard as sacred or holy the name or revealed character of the Father. The word used here is the verb form of the usual word for holiness in the New Testament. The Father is addressed as the Father in heaven. This suggests his transcendence. He is no democratic God in the sense that he is on the same level with the mob. Another petition addressed to the Father is that he forgive our sins. This shows again that in the character of this holy God is the element of mercy or grace.

The holiness of God seems to be correctly defined, then, as the moral perfection of his character.[1] As elements in this conception of the moral perfection of God, we might recognize:

a. His ethical transcendence. His goodness is more than that of any created being. It is goodness in the

[1]See Mullins, Clarke, *et al.*

absolute, eternal, underived form. In this sense Jesus says that only God is good.[1]

b. It includes the element of severity or justice. It must condemn impurity, ethical failure and sin in man.

c. It includes the mercy or grace of God. It includes all that we can conceive of as belonging to ethical goodness or perfection. Certainly from the Christian point of view God would not be perfect if he were not a God of love.

While it is true, as stated above, that the holiness of God includes the idea of his ethical transcendence, yet this does not mean that God's holiness cannot be imitated by man. The holiness of God is the reason why man should be holy and also the standard of holiness for man.[2] The perfect goodness of God is the standard of goodness for man. Jesus presents the perfection of God as the standard of perfection for man.[3] The context shows that the particular element in God's moral perfection to the front here is God's love or benevolence.

4. Relation of the moral attributes to one another. In thinking of the attributes of God, we must remember that they are qualities of a personal being. The terms used must not be thought of as terms of rigidly fixed technical meanings. These terms do have definite content, but the Bible is not a book of technical science, not even religious science. The words that describe the qualities of God, especially his moral qualities, are instinct with life and warm with personal devotion and loyalty. The relation of these attributes of God, then, must not be thought of as the relation of mechanical forces or material elements. We should not think of these attributes as the segments of a circle, lying side by side, mutually exclusive, and all together making up a mechanical whole. Their relation cannot be fixed in any such rigid and mechanical fashion. This general state-

[1]Mark 10: 18. [2]Lev. 11: 44; 1 Peter 1: 16. [3]Matt. 5: 48.

ment will become clearer if we consider the meaning of some of these terms in relation to one another.

(1) The relation of holiness to the other moral attributes. Dr. Strong defines holiness as self-affirming purity and makes it the fundamental attribute of God.[1] This definition does not seem to be inclusive enough. This will come out a little later.

In saying that holiness is the fundamental attribute of God, Dr. Strong seems to mean that holiness is more essential to the being of God than the other moral qualities, such as love. Holiness is the governing quality in his nature and everything else must bend to its demands. He gives a number of arguments in favor of this position. We cannot consider them all here. Nor is it necessary. One is to the effect that holiness is more fundamental than love, since one must be just whether he is merciful or not. Mercy may be optional but justice never. Leaving aside for the present the question of identifying holiness with justice, it may be said, from the point of view of the Christian ideal, that mercy is just as essential as justice. According to the Christian view, nothing is more essential or fundamental in God's character than love. It is true that love must be exercised in accordance with the demands of justice. Love must never be unjust or unrighteous. Neither must justice disregard the demands of love. It must never be unloving. The interests of true love and justice never clash. A man who is the impersonation of justice, without regard to the claims of love, is not the best man. Such a man would be one-sided in his moral development and might even become the synonym of cruelty rather than of goodness. On the other hand, love that is not just becomes mere sentimentality and becomes synonymous with a weak and indulgent disposition. Some people pray to God as "kind and indulgent Father." God is kind, but never indulgent. He never indulges us in our weakness and sins, but is kind and loving to save us

[1] "Sys. Theol.," Vol I, p. 268ff and 295ff.

from them. But to save us from our sins he must condemn our sins. He never lowers the standard of righteousness in order to keep from condemning us. It is not mercy to tolerate sin in us. Forgiveness with God is not an indulgent overlooking of sin in us and excusing of us in sin. There are two things connected with the forgiveness of our sins that show that it is not that kind of a transaction, but one that is in strict accord with the demands of righteousness. One is that the forgiveness of our sins is grounded in the atoning work of Christ. His blood was the propitiation for our sins. In his death God condemned the sin of the world. The forgiveness of sins is no cheap transaction. It is based on the sufferings of the Son of God who died the just for the unjust. The other thing spoken of is that the forgiveness of sins is conditioned on repentance. Before one can be forgiven he must confess himself a sinner and repudiate his sins. These two things show that the love of God that brings to us the forgiveness of sins is in strict consistency with justice. It is not true, then, that holiness or justice is more fundamental than love, nor that love is more fundamental than justice. There is no inconsistency between them.

Dr. Strong's definition of holiness as self-affirming purity undoubtedly names a true element in holiness, but the definition is not inclusive enough. Drs. Mullins, Clarke and others seem nearer the Biblical conception of the matter when they define holiness as the moral perfection of God. According to this view, the other moral qualities of God, such as righteousness and love, are elements in the holiness of God. Even in this statement of the matter, however, there is the danger of thinking of the attributes in a mechanical way, putting one down as covering so much space and another so much space and all of them making the complete circle of God's holiness. Holiness may be the most inclusive term used in the Scriptures for the moral aspect of God's being. But

righteousness and holiness are terms closely allied in meaning. The term righteousness signifies the perfect moral character of God as well as does the term holiness. And neither righteousness nor holiness is complete without love. Dr. Newman Smythe, on the other hand, would make love the more inclusive term and holiness an element in love.[1] There is this much truth in this contention, namely, that love is not complete without holiness or righteousness. Love must be holy to be true love. Because true love is holy, it is just as exacting as righteousness. Love demands the best. It would not be love if it did not demand the best.[2]

(2) Righteousness and love. As pointed out above, righteousness as well as holiness denotes the moral perfection of God. Righteousness might, therefore, be regarded as including love. This might be illustrated from the third chapter of the First Epistle of John. In this chapter the author starts out by showing that righteousness is evidence that one is a child of God. This he sets forth in the first twelve verses. Then he changes to love as an evidence of sonship to God. But a careful reading will show that in speaking of righteousness and love he is not speaking of two things, but one. Righteousness might be called the formal idea, while love is the concrete reality. One's righteousness consists in living a life of love. To love is to live a righteous life. A life without love is not a life of righteousness.

Righteousness, love and holiness, then, are not terms antagonistic, but they are ideas closely related. Either may be considered a term for the perfect moral character of God. Nor does this mean that these three terms all mean the same thing, for they do not. But it means that instead of these moral qualities being mutually antagonistic or exclusive, none of these qualities is complete without the others, and each of them, if it is true to

[1]"Christian Ethics," pp. 226, 227.
[2]See Mullins, "Christian Religion," p. 237.

form, if it is what the term really denotes, carries with it the other qualities, and hence involves the moral perfection of God.

There is in God, then, the perfect blending of every moral excellence. There is no inconsistency or conflict among these moral qualities. The trouble grows out of conceiving these attributes of God in isolation from each other. Sometimes this is carried so far as almost to represent the attributes as distinct deities and the unity of God's character is destroyed in thought.

III. **The absoluteness of God.** God is not only perfect in his moral qualities; he is also perfect in every other respect in which we can think of him. He is unlimited in wisdom and power. This applies to what is usually spoken of as the natural attributes as well as to the moral nature or character of God. We might sum up God's perfection in his "natural attributes" in the word absoluteness.

1. Meaning of the term. This term is not in very good standing with some writers on theology and philosophy; yet it denotes an idea that we cannot dispense with in our thought of God. The infinity of God means about the same thing. By the absoluteness of God is meant that he is not dependent on anything outside of himself; by his infinity we denote the unlimited fulness and perfection of his being. In this discussion the two terms, absolute and infinite, will be used interchangeably as denoting God's independence and perfection.

The term absolute has sometimes been used in the sense of the unrelated. God is not absolute in the sense of the unrelated, but in the sense that his relations to the universe are not necessary from his side. God is not dependent on the world; the world is dependent on God. God can exist without the world; the world cannot exist without God. All his relations to the world are relations that he wills. They are not imposed on him from without, but by his free act. All his relations to the

world, such as creation, preservation and redemption, are relations into which he chose to enter.

This is the difference between the conception of God's absoluteness or infinity in Christian theism and in pantheism. In pantheism God is related to the world by way of necessity. His relations to it are not the result of choice on his part. Consequently God is as dependent on the world as the world on him. God and the world are only different aspects of the same reality. On the other hand, some forms of agnosticism speak of an Absolute back of the phenomenal world, but hold that because of its absoluteness it cannot be known by man. This method of thought removes the Absolute so far away from man that he cannot be known. Pantheism brings God so near the phenomenal world that God is lost in that world. He becomes identified with its forces and processes. Pantheism makes God and the world so much alike that it blots out the distinction between God and the world, agnosticism says that they are so unlike that you cannot learn anything about the Absolute through nature. In either case, the world with its forces and processes is the only knowable reality you have left. So there is a much closer affinity between these two methods of thought than would at first appear. Over against both of these, Christian theism affirms the absoluteness of God in the sense of an independent, perfect personal life.

2. Some immediate inferences. There are certain ideas that grow immediately out of the idea of the absoluteness of God. In fact, they are so closely related to it that it is doubtful if they should be spoken of as inferences; they are certain phases of this idea. Some of these we will now notice:

(1) Self-existence. The absoluteness of God carries with it the idea that God is not dependent on anything outside of himself for his own existence. He has the source and ground of his being in himself. He is not

dependent on the world for life and being. This carries with it what is sometimes spoken of as life as an attribute; that is, not only that God is living, but also that he is the source of all that lives. He is the fountain of all life. The Bible speaks of God as the living God.[1] As the medium of God's outgoing energy, Christ is the source of life to men. In him was life and the life was the light of men.[2] He enlightens every man that comes into the world.[3] God has given him to have life in himself.[4] He is the resurrection and the life.[5] He quickens the spiritually dead.[6] He will one day call all the dead from the tomb.[7]

(2) Unity and supremacy. The unity of God denotes that there is only one God. In the nature of the case there can be only one self-existent, absolute being. This carries with it the further thought that God in his being is undivided and indivisible. This idea of the oneness of God is usually denoted by the term monotheism. This doctrine is fundamental to both the Old and New Testaments. The conception of God as Creator of heaven and earth carries with it the monotheistic idea. Abraham was called out from his own country and kindred to worship the one true God rather than the idols worshiped in his native land. Monotheism was the foundation of the Mosiac covenant with Israel.[8]

Christianity is as monotheistic as Judaism. The doctrine of the trinity must not be construed in such a way as to mean tritheism. As a matter of fact, belief in the deity of Christ did not make Paul and the other early Christians any less monotheistic. The absoluteness and unity of God were held as tenaciously by them after becoming Christians as before, and held more vitally.

Monotheism emphasizes the supremacy of God. If there is only one God, he should be worshiped by all men. The universal sway of God over the world comes out

[1] 1 Tim. 3: 15.
[2] John 1: 4.
[3] John 1: 9.
[4] John 5: 26.
[5] John 11: 25.
[6] John 5: 25.
[7] John 5: 28, 29.
[8] Ex. 20: 1-6.

clearly at places in the Old Testament, although the national exclusiveness was inconsistent with the idea. These two ideas were in conflict in Jewish religion. But God was recognized as God of the whole earth.[1] The prophets pronounce God's judgments on the neighboring nations, thereby recognizing his sovereignty over them.[2] He uses other nations to chastise Israel. In Christianity the universal element prevailed and all national exclusiveness was eliminated. This was the great issue in the case of Paul against the Judaizers.

This absolute supremacy of God is involved in Christian faith. In this faith is the element of surrender to God which contains implicitly God's universal sovereignty.

The supremacy of the one true God excludes polytheism and idolatry. Jehovah is described in the Old Testament as the one true God over against all sham or false gods. Some of the most exalted language to be found in any literature is to be found in Isaiah in describing the one supreme God as over against the idols, which are vain and helpless things.[3] Jehovah as the living God can do things. Idols can not see, hear, or accomplish anything. They are altogether vanity and nothing.[4] Jehovah is God indeed. There is no measuring his power or wisdom. He fulfills the idea and ideal of God, while idols only deceive and disappoint those who trust in them.

In the New Testament the one true God is brought to men in Jesus Christ. John says that grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.[5] This might be interpreted to mean that in experiencing the grace of God in Christ we find ultimate religious reality. We find in the next verse what that reality is when John tells us that no man has ever seen God but that the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, has declared him. It

[1]Ps. 24: 1.
[2]Isa. 13, 15, 17, 19, etc.
[3]See Isa. 40: 12ff, etc.
[4]Isa. 40: 18-29.
[5]John 1: 17.

is the grace of this God that we experience in Christ and in that experience we find ultimate religious reality in the true God. Jesus says in John 4 that the genuine worshipers must worship in spirit and in truth. They can worship in spirit because God is spirit. Spirit is the essence of his being. They can worship in truth or reality because salvation is of the Jews. The Samaritans, who worship in Mount Gerizim, know not what they worship. Therefore, they are not genuine worshipers. They do not worship the real God. Salvation is of the Jews. That is, they know the God that saves. He is real. Therefore he can have real worshipers.[1] We are told again in 1 John 5: 19, 20, that the true God, the genuine, real God is the God we know in Jesus Christ

This agrees with the position previously set forth that it is by faith in Jesus Christ that we have a true knowledge of God in an experience of redemption. Fellowship with this true God satisfies man. Nothing else will satisfy him. To put anything else in the place that belongs to God in our lives is in essence idolatry and leaves the heart restless and dissatisfied. Jesus urges that worldly cares and anxieties, the question of food and clothing, none of these things shall come between us and God. His kingdom should come first in our lives To put anything else first leaves our lives desolate and bare.

This true God always keeps his word with his people. He is always true to any revelation he makes of himself in the realm of nature or of grace. This is his veracity. He keeps every promise made to his people. This is his faithfulness. He is faithful and righteous to forgive our sins.[2]

3. The absoluteness of God in relation to the world order. We can understand more fully what is meant by the absoluteness or infinity of God if we apply the idea in certain definite respects to God; that is, if we consider it as applied to God in relation to the world order.

[1]John 4: 22-24. [2]1 John 1: 9.

(1) His presence in the world order. What about God as related to the world order in which we live? Does the historical order mean the same to him that it does to us? How is God related to that order? Man's experience in the world order is always subject to the law of space and time. His experience takes that form. He can no more prevent his experience taking this form than he can escape himself. It is doubtful if he will ever do so. What about God? Is this true of him?

There are three terms that are usually used to denote God's relations to space and time—omnipresence, eternity, and immensity.

The omnipresence of God has reference to God's immanence in the spatial and temporal order, and means that he is immanent in that order at all points of time and space. The omnipresence of God means that he is everywhere present in space and time. There is no point of space, no moment of time, where God is not present. This presence of God, however, is not to be thought of after the manner of a spatially extended object. God is not present in space after the manner of an infinitely extended substance. The spatial and temporal order is grounded rather in the mind and will of God. Since this is true, he can transcend space and time. But it is also true that because the spatial and temporal order is grounded in God, God is necessarily immanent in that order. It could not exist without him. He sustains it. His presence is the life of the universe. This is true of all orders of life and reality in the universe.

One word of caution here might be in order. The omnipresence of God does not mean that God is present everywhere in the same sense or with reference to the same end or purpose. He is not present in the rock and in the reason of Plato in the same sense. He is not present in the sinful life of Nero and the holy life of Jesus in the same sense. He is not present in hell and in heaven in the same sense or with reference to the same function or

end. In one case his presence may mean torment, in another it may mean bliss. In one case he is present to sustain the natural order as natural; in another to regenerate and sanctify the believing soul.

Eternity is used to mean that God transcends all the limitations of time. For our purpose here it makes no difference whether with realism we regard space and time as objective realities or with idealism we regard them as subjective forms of thought. The only point with which we are concerned is that the limitations of time do not apply to God. This does not mean, however, that time is not real to God or that God does not know and recognize time. Whether idealism or realism is right, time and space are real. The question at issue between them is as to the nature or kind of reality that belongs to them. In either case, we must hold that time is real to God. We cannot agree with any form of idealism that makes time unreal to God and hence undermines the significance of the historical order. The historical order is real to God. He knows it as historical. He does not know the past as future or the future as present. The distinctions of time are real for God as they are for man. These distinctions must be real for God, because they are grounded in his will. If he wills the historical order he must know it as it is; he must know it as historical. It would not be historical if the distinctions of time did not exist. The distinctions of past, present and future belong to the very essence of the world order as historical. Hence God must know these distinctions; they must be real to him if his will is the ground of the existence of that order. Any form of thought that would lose the reality of the historical order in abstractions undermines the reality of religion as well as all other forms of human culture and development. But while God knows the temporal and historical order as temporal and historical, he is not limited by time as man is. He transcends these limita-

tions. He knows the future as future, but he knows it. Man can in memory and self-consciousness, by flashes of insight into the future, transcend the limitations of time, but only very partially. What man can do partially God does completely.

The immensity of God means that he transcends the limitations imposed on man by the spatial order. God is not limited by space. What has just been said about God's relation to time will apply in a general way to space. God knows the spatial order as spatial. If this be not true, then the reality of that order is undermined, according to the theistic view of the world. But just as God transcends the limitations of time, so he transcends the limitations of space. Man can do this partially. In thought he can do so. By means of many modern inventions he can do practically in a limited way what God does fully.

These distinctions must be real for God, because they are grounded in his will. If he wills the historical order he must know it as it is; he must know it as historical. It would not be historical if the distinctions of time did not exist. The distinctions of past, present and future belong to the very essence of the world order as historical. Hence God must know these distinctions; they must be real to him if his will is the ground of the existence of that order.

(2) His knowledge of the world order. This is denoted by the term omniscience. By the omniscience of God is meant God's perfect knowledge. God knows everything that is an object of knowledge. God does not know absurdities, such as, for instance, what would take place if an irresistible force should come in contact with an immovable object. Such a question has no meaning. It is only a question in form. It can, therefore, have no answer. Some other questions that have been debated with reference to God's knowledge have about as much meaning. For instance, Does God know what would

have occurred in the history of certain possible worlds that God might have created? Or, Does God know what would have occurred as a consequence of something else that did not take place? e.g., Does God know what would have taken place if man had never sinned? Or, Does God know what would have taken place if the Jews had accepted Jesus as the Christ, instead of crucifying him? The answer to these questions one way or the other is a matter of only speculative interest. The question with which we are concerned is God's knowledge of this actual world that he has made, not his knowledge of some possible worlds that he did not make. If he ever contemplated making any other worlds, he has not so informed us and we need not bother ourselves about what would seem to be a lot of information, useless even to God, concerning some worlds that he did not see fit to create. If these worlds were not worth creating, any possible information concerning them would not be worth much, so far as anybody can see, even to God. Practically the same thing might be said with reference to the history of this world. What would have taken place if something which did not take place had taken place is of no vital concern to us, perhaps not of much concern to God.

The thing that we are vitally interested in is God's knowledge of the actual world that he has made. His knowledge of that world is perfect. This may be summed up in several statements.

a. God's knowledge is not limited by time. As stated above, God knows the temporal order. Time is real for God, not real as something outside of his control and as limiting him, but real as being known by him. The temporal and historical order is grounded in his mind and will. Therefore, he knows it completely. This order exists independently of man's will; therefore, that order in some respects is known very imperfectly by man. Except in a very limited way man knows the events of that order only as they have been historically realized in time.

But since the whole temporal order of events is grounded in God's will, he knows the temporal order as a whole. It is present as a unity in his thought. There are no surprises that come to God out of the future. The fact that God is working out a purpose in the history of the world would carry with it his perfect knowledge of the temporal order. To carry out his purpose the temporal order must be under his complete control. But it cannot be under his complete control unless it is under his perfect knowledge. The events of history must be foreknown of God else the history of the world is a series of haphazard events moving toward no purpose or goal.

b. God's knowledge is not limited by space. What has been said about the temporal order applies to the spatial order. That order as grounded in his will is also known to him. God's omnipresence in both the spatial and temporal order would carry with it his perfect knowledge of that order.

c. God's knowledge is not the result of inference on his part. He does not reason from cause to effect and thus infer what will happen in the future. He knows directly. All the forces that operate in the world as causes are grounded in his will. The whole system of things in which causes operate to produce effects is so grounded. Being thus grounded in his will, all its events are directly known to him, its effects as well as its causes.

d. God foreknows also directly the free acts of men. Since man's existence as a free agent is grounded in the will of God, all the acts of man's will are known directly to God. There is an objection to this. One way of stating it is that, since man is free and his acts, therefore, as free are indeterminate, they could not be foreknown of God. Another way of stating the objection is that, if man's acts are foreknown, they cannot be free, since to be foreknown they would have to be determined beforehand, and as determined beforehand they could not be free. In other words, this objection assumes that an act

cannot be foreknown of God and be free on man's part. It is hardly necessary to say that this is not the view of the matter taken in the Bible. The Biblical writers everywhere assume that an event can be foreknown and free. This is the spontaneous conviction also of man's religious consciousness. Man's consciousness as religious assumes that the future is known to God. As moral man's consciousness assumes that man's acts are free. To destroy either idea would be to destroy an idea fundamentally necessary to religion.

But it is necessary in this connection to remember that man's acts are foreknown of God as free; not as determined. And an event may be certain in the divine mind without being necessitated on man's part. In other words, God may foreknow an event as certain and also as coming to pass as a result of man's free choice. Man does not have to do what it is certain that he will do. One man may know enough about another man's history and character to be certain what he would do under certain circumstances, yet this element of certainty in no way interferes with the other man's freedom. How much more may this be true of the infinite mind of God.

e. God knows the events of the world order not simply as isolated or detached events, but in their relation to all the other events of that order. These events do not exist as unrelated. They do not come that way. They come as parts of the world order. The whole world order is grounded in God. He knows these events, therefore, as they are, namely, as a part of the world order. In other words, God knows the world order as a totality, as a unity. The whole time series is present to the mind of God in an undivided and indivisible act of knowledge. And since God knows the historical world order as a whole, he knows it in its parts, in its single events. But he knows them as events in the world order, in all their connections or relations in that order.

f. The fact that the world order is grounded in the will of God and is known by him carries with it the conclusion that every form of truth and every order of intelligence in the world order are grounded in the will of God as the expression of his rational nature. The world is a rational order, because it is grounded in the rational will of God. Man is an intelligent being, because he is made in the image of a God of perfect intelligence. Man's intelligence can interpret the world as a rational order, because the presence of God in the world and in man's rational nature constitutes the bond of union between the two. Man cannot rest in ignorance and darkness, because the presence of God is his constant stimulus and inspiration to search for the truth. Truth is truth, because God is what he is. Man cannot rest without knowing the truth, because God has made him as he has. Truth is not something shifting and changeable, and man's rational nature can only rest in the unchangeable truth of God.

(3) His power over the world order. This power is described by the term omnipotence. By the omnipotence of God is meant that all the power there is in the universe, physical or spiritual, has its source in God. He, therefore, can do anything that power can do. Some things cannot be done because they are inconsistent with the order that God has ordained for the world, whether that order be conceived of as grounded in the rational nature of God or as ordained merely of God's will. As an illustration of the latter, God could not make two mountains side by side without a valley between. As an illustration of the former, he could not make two and two to be five. He could not make a lie to be the truth. Nor can God do that which is inconsistent with his own moral nature. God cannot lie. To do so would be to deny his very nature as God. To say that he cannot lie or that he can do no wrong is not to limit God's power. To do a morally

wrong or rationally absurd thing is not an evidence of strength, but of weakness.

These limitations, then, if limitations they might be called, are such as are placed on God by his own moral and rational nature. God must be consistent with himself. Not to do so would in no way be an evidence of power, but of the lack of power. God also respects the world order which he has established. He does not act inconsistently with that order. For instance, he respects man's freedom. He does not deal with man in such a way as to do violence to his nature as a free being. There is no limitation involved in this, however, other than a self-limitation. The only limitation is the one imposed by the nature or will of God in ordaining man's existence as free. The same may be said concerning any other limitation placed on God by the order of the world.

An objection is sometimes made to the omnipotence of God on the ground that the omnipotence of God would interfere with the freedom of man. This is simply another phase of the objection to the infinity or absoluteness of God. It is urged against the omniscience of God. The omniscience and omnipotence of God are simply phases of the infinity of God in relation to creation. The objection is that, if God has all power, then man has none. No doubt, the omnipotence or infinity of God has been held in such a way as to justify this criticism. For instance, when a man holds such a view of the omnipotence of God that his view could be summed up in the statement: "All power is the direct exercise of the will of God," then there is no room left for freedom on man's part. This seems to be about the view held by Jonathan Edwards. Accordingly Edwards held a view of the will that left little room for moral responsibility. This view has little influence in theology to-day, but there are forms of philosophy that hold practically the same view on this point. It was over against this absolutist philosophy which swallows everything up in the infinite, that Mr. William

James held his view of a limited, finite God. The philosophy of absolute idealism holds that man is only a moment or element in the infinite life. This is true of the bad man as well as the good man. The bad man bears a relation to the life of the infinite similar to the relation of a bad impulse to the life of a good man. This would destroy both the holiness of God and the freedom of man. Mr. James insisted, therefore, that God was not infinite. He is finite. If there is any God, he is a worker and doubtless is doing the best he can to overcome sin and evil, but even God cannot guarantee the outcome. If the outcome could be guaranteed, that would destroy freedom and initiative and would take the moral zest out of life. For life to have any moral significance there must be the element of risk, of adventure. So as over against the absolutist God of Mr. Royce and others Mr. James chose to believe in a finite and limited God, who was no cold, abstract Infinite, but a doer, yet a doer of such limited power that there was no guarantee of the outcome. Moreover, Mr. James held that this was the view of ordinary Christian theism.[1]

But, as a matter of fact, Christian theism holds to both the absoluteness of God and man's freedom. Both ideas are found side by side all through the Scriptures with no apparent sense of contradiction on the part of the writers. Nor is this due to a naive and uncritical attitude of mind on their part, which overlooked apparent contradictions, but it is due rather to religious insight, which the philosopher as such does not possess. Mr. James protests against what he called "vicious abstractionism" in philosophy. But his setting the infinity of God and the freedom of man over against each other and rejecting the former in the interest of the latter is a good illustration of "vicious abstractionism," that is, the tendency to take a truth out of its relations and set it over against, and in opposition to, another truth to which it is really

[1]See "Pragmatism" and "Pluralistic Universe."

not opposed. It was an indication of a healthy moral sense on his part when he insisted on holding to the freedom of man, even if it meant the rejection of the absoluteness of God, especially as he confessed that logical reasoning led to the idea of God's absoluteness. But, while it indicated a healthy moral sense, it also indicated poor judgment, as the two ideas are not mutually exclusive. God is not absolute in the sense of including man's will as a part of himself, but in the sense that man's being is grounded in God and God is the ultimate source of all man's power. In this sense the almightiness of God is the ground of man's freedom rather than its antithesis. The objection might be put in the form of a question, thus: How can a God almighty, absolute in power, give man the power to oppose God's will? If God's will is absolute, no one can oppose that will. But we might ask: How can God be almighty if he has not the power to create a free being, who can oppose his will? Which would indicate greater power, the ability to create a free personal being as the climax of creation or to create a world that never rose above the mechanical plane?

The general religious consciousness of mankind testifies to the truth of both ideas. Man has the ineradicable sense of moral freedom and responsibility. At the same time, he has the sense of absolute dependence which implies the existence of an absolute being on whom he depends. Besides, Christian faith testifies to the truth of both. Faith is a principle of trust in God as a God of absolute power and goodness. At the same time, faith is a principle of action, carrying with it the idea of man's relative independence or freedom. Faith trusts, but it also achieves. It submits, but it also asserts itself. It is a receptive principle, but it is also a creative principle.

We must keep in mind also that the sovereignty of God that grows out of his almightiness is to be thought of as moral. It is not the almightiness of sheer force. It is the rule of a righteous and loving Father, but it is

nevertheless the rule of power. To think of the omnipotence of God as the sovereignty of sheer force, is to think of him after the manner of Mohammedanism. The Christian conception is the thought of God as the omnipotent person of perfect goodness and love.

CHAPTER III

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

I. Reasons for emphasizing the doctrine.
   1. The prominence given the subject in the Scriptures.
   2. Stands for indispensable element in religion.
   3. Importance of the work of the Spirit in the life of the Christian.
   4. Revival of interest in the subject.

II. Nature and personality of the Spirit.
   1. Meaning of term spirit.
   2. The Spirit of God.
   3. The personality of the Spirit.
      (1) What is meant by the term.
      (2) Proof.
         a. Argument stated.
            (a) Use of masculine pronoun in speaking of the Spirit.
            (b) Personal activities ascribed to the Spirit.
            (c) Can be treated as a person.
            (d) Possesses personal powers.
            (e) Produces personal qualities in man.
         b. An objection to the argument answered.

III. Relation of the Holy Spirit to Jesus Christ.
   1. To the earthly life and personal ministry of Jesus.
      (1) Child Jesus begotten of the Spirit.
      (2) Sinless character developed under power of the Spirit.
      (3) Messianic mission performed under guidance of the Spirit.
         a. Anointed at baptism.
         b. Sustained in temptation.
         c. Guided in teaching and preaching.
         d. Endued for miracles.
         e. Raised from the dead.
      (4) Summary: Jesus subordinate to Spirit during earthly life and ministry.

2. To the glorified Christ.
   (1) The Spirit subordinate to Christ.
   (2) The Spirit's work related to Christ.
   (3) Pentecost related to the cross and resurrection.
   (4) Submission to Christ the condition of spiritual power.

IV. The work of the Spirit in nature and grace.

1. In nature.
   (1) Preliminary considerations.
      a. What is included.
      b. Ideas that throw light on relation of the Spirit to nature.
         (a) Divine immanence.
         (b) Relation of Christ to creation and preservation.
      c. Most material in Old Testament
   (2) Biblical teaching.
   (3) Conclusions.
      a. Spirit present in all God's works in nature.
      b. Spirit would have worked in human life even if man had not sinned.
2. In salvation.
   (1) Conviction—convicting work related to Christ.
      a. Jesus ideal of righteousness.
      b. Unbelief essence of sin.
      c. Unbelief involves judgment.
      d. Conviction of sin, righteousness and judgment one work, not three.
   (2) Regeneration.
      a. Regenerates by producing faith.
      b. Faith and regeneration inseparable and synchronous.
      c. Spirit works as an inner power harmonious with man's nature.
   (3) Assurance of salvation.
      a. The function of the Spirit.
      b. The Spirit of adoption.
      c. Sealed in the Spirit.
   (4) Growth in righteousness.
   (5) The resurrection.
      a. The Spirit as God's pledge.
      b. The Spirit as the power of resurrection.
      c. The whole creation waiting for redemption.
3. Some conclusions as to how the Spirit works.
   (1) The Spirit makes real in us what Christ wrought out for us.

(2) The truth of the gospel is the means used by the Spirit.
(3) Man is left free.
4. The Spirit's work in qualifying us for service.
(1) Terms used.
a. "Baptism in the Spirit."
b. "Endued with power."
c. "Filled with the Spirit."
d. "Poured out," "shed forth."
e. "Gift of the Spirit."
(2) Work of the Spirit in salvation and in service.
(3) Crisis and gradual growth in power.
(4) Repeated enduements or infillings.
5. The Holy Spirit in the Church.
(1) Constitutes a church by bringing men into fellowship with one another.
(2) Bestows gifts necessary for work and worship of the church.
a. Diversity of gifts.
b. Purpose of gifts.
c. Spirit's sovereignty in distribution of gifts.
d. Spirit's function in worship.
e. Call to special service.

I. **Reasons for emphasizing this doctrine.** The doctrine of the Holy Spirit has not been given the prominence in treatises on theology that the subject deserves. Usually the person of Christ and the attributes of God have been given extended treatment, but the subject of the Holy Spirit has ordinarily been dismissed with a few paragraphs or, at most, a few pages. This has been partly compensated for by considering the person and work of the Spirit in connection with the doctrine of salvation. But the importance of the subject would surely call for a more distinct treatment.

What are some of the things that would warrant a careful treatment of the subject in a study of Christian doctrine?

1. One is the prominence given the subject in the Scriptures. Much prominence is given this subject throughout the Bible, both in the Old and the New Testaments. From the first chapter of Genesis, in which the Spirit

broods over the chaos of creation, to the last chapter of Revelation, in which the Spirit joins with the bride in inviting sinners to come to Christ, this doctrine is emphasized.

2. We will see the importance of this doctrine also if we remind ourselves that it stands for an element in the Christian religion that is indispensable and which no other doctrine provides for. That element is the idea of the immanence of God in the world and human life in general, but especially in Christian experience. Christianity as a religion is both historical and experimental. Jesus supplies the historical element. Jesus as a historical character stands for the coming of God into human history. The Holy Spirit stands for the coming of God into human life experimentally. The two ideas are vitally connected and they supplement each other. And each is essential to Christianity. Without either factor Christianity becomes perverted and loses its vitality and power.

3. To be more specific, this subject should be given careful consideration because of the importance of the work of the Spirit in the life of the Christian. Without the regenerating and sanctifying power of the Spirit there can be no Christian life. Without the guiding and empowering work of the Spirit there can be no effective service to Christ in the kingdom of God. It is only in and through the Spirit that Christ is made real to men and his work becomes effective in us for our salvation from sin. The Holy Spirit is the producer of every noble intention, unselfish thought, and deed of service in the lives of men. To understand more of the nature and work of the Spirit will help us to relate our lives to him more effectively so that our progress in the Christian life will be hastened.

4. Another reason for giving special attention to this doctrine is that, while not very extensive treatment has been given the subject in theological treatises, yet in re-

cent days there has been quite a revival of interest in the study of the subject. This study has been largely of a popular, practical and devotional type. It is a favorite theme for discussion at religious conferences and assemblies, especially those that look to the deepening of the devotional and spiritual life of Christians. Many books and pamphlets have been issued on the subject. Many of these are practical and helpful, but, on the other hand, many of them are one-sided, tending to an overemphasized emotionalism or quietism, or even, in some cases, fanaticism. Many ideas are advanced that are unscriptural and hurtful. They are not the less hurtful, but more, by virtue of the fact that they are advanced by zealous and well-meaning Christians, men often of great effectiveness and spiritual power. But their effectiveness and spiritual power only make their hurtful and unscriptural doctrine of the Spirit the more dangerous, giving it wider publicity and more general acceptance.

II. **The nature and personality of the Spirit**. We will take up now a consideration of the nature and personality of the Spirit.

1. The meaning of the term spirit. The Hebrew term translated "spirit" in the Old Testament seems originally to mean breath, or wind, and later spirit. In the Greek we have about the same thing. We can readily see how the breath of man would be associated with the life principle or spirit in man, since when man's breath stops life is gone out of the body.

The term is used in the Bible to denote the animating principle in man or beast. It denotes, therefore, the life of the body.[1] It also denotes a disposition of mind or character.[2] We use the term in that sense now, as when we speak of a charitable spirit, a spirit of forgiveness, a spirit of revenge, etc. It is also used to designate the disembodied soul of man after death.[3] It denotes an evil

[1]Ps. 104: 29, 30; Ecc. 3: 19.
[2]Ps. 51: 17; Zech. 12: 10.
[3]Ecc. 12: 7.

spiritual power or personality that possessed men and women and produced all sorts of physical, mental and moral ills.[1]

2. The Spirit of God. The Spirit is the inner life principle within God himself. The Spirit constitutes the principle of understanding in God as the spirit of man is the principle of understanding in man.[2] In general the Spirit of God or the Spirit of Jehovah means the outgoing energy or power of God working toward an end. The Spirit of Jehovah came upon men in the Old Testament to produce various results. The Spirit stands for the presence of God with men. It stands over against the idea of the transcendence of God and prevents religion from becoming the worship of an absentee God. It supplements the idea of transcendence. This idea comes over into the New Testament. But there the idea of the divine presence becomes more intimate. The emphasis there, especially in Paul and John, is placed upon the divine indwelling through the Spirit.[3] The people of God are called God's temple.[4] They are the place of the divine abode among men. The church is the house of the living God.[5] The church is the body of Christ.[6] It is animated and indwelt by his Spirit.

3. The personality of the Spirit.

(1) What is meant by the personality of the Spirit? By the personality of the Spirit is meant that the Spirit possesses a self-conscious life relatively independent of the life of the Godhead as a whole or from that of the Father and the Son. The term personality must not be construed to mean that there is the same separateness among the three inner distinctions of the Godhead that there is among human individuals. There is an underlying unity. There is only one God. Yet the New Testament represents the relations of the Father, Son and Holy

[1]Mark 5: 1ff; 9: 14ff.
[2]1 Cor. 2: 10ff.
[3]John 14: 17; Eph. 3: 16, 17.
[4]1 Cor. 3: 16.
[5]1 Tim. 3: 15.
[6]Rom. 12: 4ff; 1 Cor. 12: 12ff.

Spirit to be such that they must be conceived as representing three centers of self-consciousness within the life of deity.

(2) Proof of the personality of the Spirit. To prove the personality of the Spirit we will have to come to the New Testament. We will not find it in the Old. There may be intimations of it in the Old, but nothing more than that. Nor will we find anything that clearly implies the personality of the Spirit until we come near the close of the public ministry of Jesus.

a. Note the following evidences for the personality of the Spirit: (a) The masculine pronoun is applied to the Spirit in spite of the fact that the term translated "Spirit" is neuter in the Greek.[1] The same thing is suggested by the term Paraclete used for the Spirit.[2] This term is applied to Jesus himself in 1 John 2: 1.

(b) Personal activities are ascribed to the Spirit. He teaches.[3] He guides into truth.[4] He bears witness.[5] He convicts concerning sin, righteousness and judgment.[6] He speaks.[7] He calls men into distinctive work.[8] He directs men into particular fields of labor.[9]

(c) He can be treated as a person: lied to, sinned against, resisted.[10]

(d) The Spirit possesses personal powers: mind,[11] sensibility,[12] will.[13]

(e) Since the Spirit is the power that produces righteousness, holiness, love in the hearts of men, he must himself have a moral nature. An impersonal power could not be the author of these highest of all personal moral qualities in man.

b. It might be objected that the preceding argument is not conclusive on the ground that it only proves that

[1]John 16: 7, 8, 13, 14.
[2]John 14: 16; 16: 7.
[3]John 14: 26; Luke 12: 12.
[4]John 16: 13.
[5]John 15: 26.
[6]John 16: 7-11.
[7]Acts 8: 29; 13: 2.
[8]Acts 13: 2.
[9]Acts 16: 6.
[10]Acts 5: 3; Matt. 12: 31; Acts 7: 51.
[11]Rom. 8: 27.
[12]Eph. 4: 30.
[13]1 Cor. 12: 11.

God is a personal God and that the Spirit only signifies the outgoing energy of this personal God. These personal qualities and activities are simply the qualities and activities of the personal God who comes into human life through his Spirit, or his own spiritual presence.

This explanation might be allowed as accounting for the facts mentioned if it were not for the further fact that the New Testament clearly distinguishes between God and his Spirit in such a way as to forbid considering the Spirit as being only one phase or manifestation of the unipersonal God. For instance in John 14: 16 Jesus says he will pray the Father and the Father will send the Paraclete. The Paraclete is here spoken of in such a way as to imply personal distinction from the Father and the Son. Besides, Jesus here speaks of the Spirit as "another" Paraclete; that is, this "other" is to be to them what Jesus has been except in a larger and more glorious way.[1] The word for "other" here is the word that means another of the same kind, not of a different kind. Moreover, Jesus speaks of the Spirit in this farewell discourse in such a way as to make the impression that he is speaking of a personal friend.

Another passage where this distinction is implied is in the baptismal formula as given in Matt. 28: 19. Another is in the apostolic benediction in 2 Cor. 13: 14. See also 1 Cor. 12: 4-6. Taking, then, these two sets of facts together, the passages that attribute to the Spirit personal qualities and activities and those that distinguish the Spirit from the Father and the Son, they show clearly that the New Testament writers thought of the Spirit as personal. Neither set of passages might be altogether conclusive within itself. If we had only the passages that attribute personal activities and qualities to the Spirit, we might think that these personal activities and qualities were the activities and qualities of the unipersonal God thought of in certain relations to

[1] John 14: 16; 16: 7-11.

the religious life of man. As to the second set of passages, those that distinguish the Spirit from the Father and the Son, these are convincing even by themselves, and are still more so when taken in connection with the former class.

III. **The relation of the Holy Spirit to Jesus Christ.** We consider next the relation of the Holy Spirit to Jesus Christ. There are two distinct phases of this subject.

1. The Spirit's relation to the earthly life and personal ministry of Jesus. From the Gospel records we gather that there was a close relation between the Holy Spirit and the earthly life and personal ministry of Jesus. These Gospel records justify the following statements:

(1) The child Jesus was begotten in the womb of the virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit.[1] The doctrine of the virgin birth has already been discussed. Here we are concerned only with the relation of the Holy Spirit to the fact. The Holy Spirit was thus the author of the human nature of Jesus. This helps us to understand his sinlessness.[2] To attribute the human nature of Jesus to the Holy Spirit is not inconsistent with the idea that the pre-existent Christ voluntarily assumed human nature.[3]

(2) While there are no express Scripture statements to that effect, we believe that we are justified in holding that the development of the sinless character of Jesus was due to the indwelling power, presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit. This would seem to follow from the fact that his human nature was created by the Spirit in the womb of the virgin. The sinless character of Jesus was developed under the guidance of the same Spirit that originated his human nature. Luke tells us that Jesus was led by the Spirit during the forty days in the

[1]Matt. 1: 20; Luke 1: 35.
[2]See Luke 1: 35.
[3]Phil. 2: 5ff.

wilderness.[1] He also says that after the wilderness temptation, Jesus returned to Galilee in the power of the Spirit.[2] Are we not, then, led to infer that Jesus resisted the wilderness temptation and won his victory over sin and Satan in the power of the Spirit? We would also infer this from the fact that he was dependent on the Spirit in all his teaching and Messianic work.

(3) In the performance of his Messianic mission, Jesus was subordinate to the Holy Spirit.

a. At his baptism the Holy Spirit came upon him to anoint him for the work of his mission.[3] Jesus had, in baptism, just devoted himself to death for the salvation of the world. Doubtless the coming of the Spirit upon him was the Father's seal of approval on him as the Lamb who, by the sacrifice of himself, should take away the sin of the world.

b. In the power of the Spirit he resisted the temptation to turn aside from the way of suffering and death and accept power and glory at the hands of Satan.[4]

c. He taught and preached in the power of the Spirit.[5]

d. He performed his miracles in the power of the Spirit.[6]

e. While it is probable that the expressions "eternal Spirit" in Heb. 9: 13, 14, and "Spirit of holiness" in Rom. 1: 4 refer to the spiritual or higher side of Christ's being, yet we are doubtless justified in holding that Christ's redemptive achievement in his death and resurrection was accomplished under the power and guidance of the Spirit. This would follow from the preceding statements and from his submission to the Father in the matter of his death.[7] The agency of the Spirit in his resurrection is suggested by Paul's statement in Rom. 8: 11.

[1]Luke 4: 1, 2.
[2]Luke 4: 14.
[3]Luke 3: 21, 22.
[4]See above.
[5]John 3: 34; Luke 4: 18.
[6]Matt. 12: 28.
[7]Matt. 26: 39ff.

(4) We are justified, then, in saying that in his earthly life and personal mission on earth Jesus was entirely subordinate to the Spirit and completely under the Spirit's control. His sinless development, his holy character, his redemptive work were all achieved under the guidance and power of the Spirit.

2. The relation of the Spirit to the glorified Christ as Savior and Lord.

(1) The Spirit subordinate to Christ. When we come to the person of the ascended and glorified Christ we find the situation reversed. The Holy Spirit is now subordinate to Christ.

The Spirit was promised by Jesus toward the close of his ministry.[1] He dwells on the coming of the other Paraclete who is to take his place. Also, after the resurrection he tells them to tarry in Jerusalem until endued with power from on high.[2] They are to be baptized in the Holy Spirit.[3]

The Spirit was to be sent by Christ, or sent by the Father at his request. Peter said on the day of Pentecost that the risen Christ had shed forth the Holy Spirit on them. Christ baptized the disciples in the Holy Spirit.[4]

All the work of the Holy Spirit in and for men has reference to the person and work of Christ. The Spirit does no work, performs no function in human life, that does not have reference to Jesus as Lord and Christ.

(2) The Spirit's work related to Christ. The Spirit was to bear witness to Christ. He was to receive of the things of Christ and show them unto the disciples. He was to guide them into the truth, but it was to be the truth about Christ.[5] He regenerates, sanactifies, saves men by bringing them into right relation with Christ. It is the work of the Spirit to convict sinners and lead them

[1]John 14 to 16, inclusive.
[2]Luke 24: 49.
[3]Acts 1: 5.
[4]John 14: 16; 16: 7; 20: 22; Acts 2: 33.
[5]John 15: 26.

to repentance and faith. All this he does by revealing Christ. He comes, not that men might see him, but that they might see Christ. The Spirit is to faith what light is to the natural eye. Ordinarily in the presence of light we are not conscious of the light, but rather of the objects that we see through the medium of light. The Spirit is the medium through which we see Christ. The Spirit calls not attention to himself, but to Christ and his redemptive grace.

(3) Pentecost related to the cross and resurrection. Pentecost, then, was the releasing of the redemptive energy of the cross and resurrection of Jesus. This will explain why Pentecost follows the cross and the resurrection. The Holy Spirit had been in the world before Pentecost, but his power was operative only in proportion as the truth of God had been revealed. His power in the Old Testament age was limited because God had spoken only in divers portions and in divers manners to his people and because God's plan of redemption had been only partially worked out in human history. When Jesus, the embodiment of truth, came into the world, the Holy Spirit came in a new way in his life; and when the gospel had become an accomplished fact in history, then the Holy Spirit came in his fulness and power. But before the Holy Spirit could fully empower the preacher of the gospel there must be a gospel to preach.

Pentecost was the vindication of Christ. He had been rejected and condemned. He had been crucified as a criminal. The resurrection and Pentecost were to reverse this judgment of the world. Was Jesus to be forever looked upon as a criminal? No. The judgment of the Sanhedrin and of Pilate was to be reversed. The judgment that has been pronounced upon him must be the judgment of his judges. Otherwise there was no hope for truth and righteousness in the world.

Pentecost was the manifestation of the power of the risen, ascended and glorified Lord.[1] During his earthly life, Christ had been limited. Now these limitations have been removed. He has now ascended to glory. The coming of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost in accordance with his promise was evidence that Jesus had reached his destination and had been enthroned at the right hand of God. Henceforth he is to rule. The work of the Holy Spirit is to make him regnant in the hearts and lives of men. The presence of the Holy Spirit is the presence of the ascended, glorified Christ. He is the spiritual Christ. It is in and through the Holy Spirit that Christ is spiritually present with his peoples. He is the *"alter ego"* of Christ.

(4) Submission to Christ the condition of spiritual power. Here is a practical application of this truth. We are not to preach the Holy Spirit but rather to preach Christ in the power of the Spirit. What are the conditions of receiving the power of the Spirit? They may all be summed up in one thing—a right relation to Jesus Christ. The man who surrenders to Jesus Christ, who seeks to honor him, who makes it the first business of his life to do the will of Christ, can know the power of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit came to glorify Christ and he will honor any man who honors Christ.

IV. **The work of the Spirit in the realms of nature and of grace.** Let us now consider the work of the Spirit in the realms of nature and of grace.

1. In nature.

(1) Preliminary considerations:

a. This is meant to include everything except the work of the Spirit in man's salvation—in other words, everything except the "realm of grace." There is a natural, as well as a supernatural, work of the Spirit. The Spirit of God has to do with the ordinary processes and ongoings of the natural world.

[1]Acts 2: 32-36.

b. It will probably help us in approaching the subject, if we remember two other doctrines. One is a doctrine very much emphasized in modern theology and philosophy; that is, the doctrine of the divine immanence. The idea that God is immanent in all the forces and processes of nature is a commonplace of theology. We no longer consider nature as a self-operating machine. This doctrine of the indwelling of God in all things will prepare us to consider the work of the Spirit in nature. We can see why this is true if we remember what has been said to the effect that the doctrine of the Spirit stands for the immanence of God in the world and human life.

Another doctrine that will help us in approaching this subject is the teaching of John and Paul with reference to the relation of Christ to creation and preservation. John tells us that all things came to be through him.[1] Paul says that all things were created in him and that all things consist or hold together in him.[2] Apart from Christ nothing has come to be or continues to be.. In view of the cosmic functions of Christ, we can see that the Spirit works in the natural world, and at the same time understand that all his work has reference to Christ and his work. This is perhaps as true in the realm of nature as it is in the realm of grace.

c. For most of our Biblical material on this topic we go to the Old Testament. In general it seems that the Old Testament gives to the Holy Spirit a place in nature similar to that given him in the New Testament in the realm of grace or the work of salvation. There is, however, some material in the New Testament.

(2) The Biblical teaching. The Spirit of God broods over the chaos of creation.[3] The breath of God animated the dust of the ground and man became a living soul.[4] The Spirit creates animal life.[5] The Spirit gives

[1]John 1: 3.
[2]Col. 1: 17.
[3]Gen. 1: 2.
[4]Gen. 2: 7.
[5]Ps. 104: 30.

physical strength.[1] The Spirit gives military power and skill.[2] The Spirit gives mechanical skill.[3] Through the Spirit, God is omnipresent.[4]

(3) Conclusions. a. The Holy Spirit is present in all operations of God in nature as well as in grace. Man's natural life and endowments, as well as his supernatural life and endowments, are the work of the Holy Spirit. The same power that creates man in the image of the first Adam also re-creates him in the moral image of the last Adam. The natural is the basis of the spiritual. The natural is made for the spiritual and only finds its true end as it is used as a basis for the development of the spiritual.

b. This raises a question. Would the Holy Spirit have had any function or office in relation to human life if man had not sinned? We answer, "Yes." If man had not sinned, he never could have attained his true destiny apart from communion and fellowship with God. To live without such fellowship is sin. One element in all sin is the breaking of such communion. This is seen in the sin of the first man. So doubtless, if man had not sinned, God, through his indwelling Spirit, would have guided man in his moral and spiritual life to his true destiny.

2. In salvation. The outstanding work of the Holy Spirit is not in the realm of nature but in the realm of grace. It is in man's religious life that he has conscious dealings with God through the Spirit that enables man to interpret nature as the work of the Spirit. If it were not for this conscious communion of the Spirit, we could never give religious interpretation to nature. But the more clearly man experiences the Spirit's presence in his life the more clearly will he see the Spirit's presence in the world around him.

[1]Judges 14: 6.
[2]Judges 11: 29-33.
[3]Ex. 31: 3.
[4]Ps. 139: 7ff.

The work of the Spirit in salvation begins in conviction for sin and ends in the resurrection and glorification of the body.

(1) Conviction. The outstanding passage here is John 16: 8-11. Without attempting a detailed exegesis of this Scripture, but as based on this and other passages, we may lay down the following propositions:

a. Jesus is the true ideal of righteousness. When he went back to God he was vindicated as righteous, although he had been condemned as a sinner. No righteousness short of that of the sinless Son of God will meet the demands of a true standard. No man understands what true righteousness is if he is satisfied with anything less than the righteous life of Christ. A part of the work of the Holy Spirit is to give men an understanding of the fact that any lower standard is a false standard.

b. Failure to believe in Christ is the acme and essence of sin. Unbelief is the damning sin of the world. This is true, not only in the sense that it is a refusal to appropriate the remedy for sin, but also in the sense that unbelief is the principle of sin. Sin develops in its nature only in the presence of moral light. Jesus says that, if he had not come, his rejectors had not had sin. He is the light of the world, but men loved darkness rather than light. They refused the light, and this refusal is the climax of sin. The work of the Holy Spirit is to make men see this. He makes men to realize that rejecting Christ is not simply a matter of bad taste or ill manners; it is the essence of all sin. The reason men reject Christ is because of bad hearts.

c. This rejection of Christ has the most awful consequences. It involves one in the righteous judgment of God. Satan and the forces of evil judged Christ and condemned him to death, but God reversed their judgment. The judgment with which Satan and the forces of evil condemned Christ came back on them. In con-

demning Christ they condemned themselves. The prince of this world has been judged. Those who with him reject and condemn Christ must share his judgment. To make men realize this is the work of the Holy Spirit.

d. To convict the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment is not three works but one. It is simply three aspects of the same thing. Christ is the standard of righteousness. To refuse to believe in him is sin. To sin is to be involved in the judgment of the chief of sinners—the prince of this world. The Holy Spirit makes men to see that their righteousness or condemnation depends upon their attitude to Jesus Christ.

(2) Regeneration. The Holy Spirit regenerates by bringing men, through repentance and faith on their part, into right relation with Christ. In many ways in the Scriptures Christ is represented as our life, but he can be our life only as we are brought into right relation with him. Not only can the sinner do nothing to merit his salvation, but he cannot even receive salvation within and of himself. He cannot even desire it. The desire for salvation and the capacity to appropriate it must be created in the sinner's heart by the Holy Spirit. The power to appropriate grace is itself a work of grace. The creation of the disposition and power in the sinner's heart to receive Christ is a part, at least, of the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit. But it is not true that the Holy Spirit creates such a disposition and power and then leaves the sinner of himself to act out this disposition. The Spirit works in the sinner both to will and to do; and regeneration is not completed until the doing is completed, until faith is a fact. Repentance and faith are themselves the work of the Spirit in our hearts. To produce repentance and faith in the sinner's heart is to regenerate him. Man, however, is not passive in the process. He is active; but his activity is itself the work of the Spirit. "If any man be in Christ Jesus, there is a new creation," but it is a moral and

spiritual creation and takes place according to moral and spiritual laws, not according to physical and mechanical laws: i. e., God deals with man as a person, not as a "thing."

Evidently, then, the divine Spirit does not operate as an external force—as a power foreign to man's nature. The power that renews man's moral nature in the image of Christ by securing his response to the truth of the gospel is the same power that constituted man a moral and rational being. The divine Spirit is the constitutive agent of man's nature. That Spirit indwells and interpenetrates all man's rational and moral faculties and powers. Man is created that he might be recreated. He is born that he might be born again. Sinful and fallen humanity is being recreated in the moral and spiritual image of God, and the man who misses this misses life that is life indeed.

(3) Assurance of salvation. What now is the function of the Holy Spirit in relation to assurance? It is the same as in regeneration or salvation generally. It is to enable us to appropriate Christ. The means used to this end is the "word of promise."

Dr. Strong says:[1] "The ground of faith (meaning saving faith) is the external word of promise. The ground of assurance, on the other hand, is the inward witness of the Spirit that we fulfill the conditions of the promise." Is it not better to say that the ground of assurance as well as of saving faith is the word of promise contained in the gospel? It is the work of the Spirit in the case of both saving faith and of assurance to enable us to appropriate the word of promise. Our assurance depends on the clearness and fulness of our appropriation of gospel truth.

Faith appropriates, not so much the inner witness of the Spirit, as the truth about Christ and his saving work. The Spirit's work is to enable us thus to appro-

[1] "Sys. Theol.," Vol. III, p. 844.

priate Christ. The inner witness of the Spirit is not something unrelated to the saving truth of the gospel. The work of the Spirit is to bear witness to Christ. The Spirit bears witness by enabling faith to appropriate Christ.

The Holy Spirit is in our hearts the Spirit of adoption, causing us to cry "Abba, Father." "The Spirit bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God"[1]—not with our spirits in the sense of "to them" but "along with them" (Greek "sun"). But the testimony of the Holy Spirit is not one testimony and the testimony of our spirits another testimony; rather it is the same testimony looked at from different angles. Our spirits could not bear testimony to sonship with God within themselves. It is only the enabling power of the Spirit of God that causes them to do so. And this the Spirit does by enabling our spirits by faith to appropriate the truth of Christ. Notice that Paul goes on to add: "And if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." We are the children and heirs of God because we share the inheritance and the sonship of Christ. Our consciousness of sonship and inheritance comes then by knowledge of the truth about Christ. To produce assurance of salvation we do not need, then, so much to preach the Holy Spirit and his work as Christ and his work.

Again, Paul talks about our being sealed in the Holy Spirit unto the day of redemption. The Holy Spirit in our hearts is the earnest, the first-fruits, of our final redemption. But how is the Holy Spirit thus the earnest or pledge of the redemption of our bodies? Is it simply by dwelling within and producing some kind of indefinite feeling in us that everything is all right? No, it is by enabling us to lay hold of the crucified and risen Christ, and his power to raise our bodies from the dead. There is a very definite relation between the Holy Spirit

[1]Rom. 8: 14-17.

within us as the guarantee of our final redemption, and the work of the Christ for us on the cross and in the resurrection. The Spirit assures us of our final redemption by enabling us to see the risen, glorified Christ. The Spirit within us gives this vision of Christ triumphant over death. This vision of faith carries with it the assurance that we too shall triumph over death.

(4) Growth in righteousness. The work of developing the divine life within us is the work of the Holy Spirit. As holy, he strives to create holiness in the lives of men. He is the creator of all righteousness in the lives of men. All good thoughts, impulses, deeds, have their source in him. The Holy Spirit sanctifies as he regenerates, by enabling us to appropriate Christ. He leads us into a deeper knowledge of Christ, and a closer fellowship with him. By revealing more of Christ to us we are made more like him.

(5) The resurrection of the body. The New Testament represents the resurrection of the body as an essential part of our salvation and as the consummation of it. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. Death will be vanquished when Christ comes back to raise the bodies of his people from the dead.[1]

a. Paul clearly teaches that the indwelling Spirit is God's pledge that he will raise our bodies from the dead. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of assurance, not only in the sense that the Spirit bears testimony to our present acceptance with God, as the Spirit of adoption causing us to cry "Abba, Father;"[2] but also in this same Spirit we are sealed unto the day of redemption.[3] This day of redemption is the day of the redemption of the body, the resurrection day.[4] The Spirit himself abiding in our hearts as the first-fruits of the coming harvest of redemption makes us to groan within ourselves, looking forward to that glorious consummation. We are thus

[1] 1 Cor. 15: 20ff.
[2] Rom. 8: 14-17.
[3] Eph. 4: 30.
[4] Rom. 8: 23.

saved in hope.[1] We are looking for more glorious things than we have yet received, things of which we have as yet received only a foretaste. But the Spirit in our hearts is God's pledge, his guarantee, that the work will be completed in the day of final redemption. For this reason, Paul speaks of the Holy Spirit as the Holy Spirit of promise—not the Spirit who was promised in the Old Testament or by Jesus during his earthly life, but the Spirit who is in our hearts the promise of our final and complete redemption, as the context clearly shows. He is the Spirit of promise by virtue of the fact that he is "the earnest of our inheritance," who seals us unto the day of redemption, unto the praise of the glory of God.[2]

b. According to the more probable text, Paul said in Rom. 8: 11 that our mortal bodies are to be brought to life through God's Spirit who dwells in us. If the other reading, "because of his Spirit," be correct, then the passage would say about what has been said in the preceding paragraph. But in that case the inference would be almost irresistible that, since the Spirit dwelling in us is the pledge of our redemption, it is through the power of this indwelling Spirit that the redemption is to be accomplished.

c. In Rom. 8: 23, Paul represents the whole creation as groaning and travailing in pain together, waiting for this final redemption of the sons of God. This might justify the conclusion that the Spirit, as immanent in creation, is not only working to bring God's redeemed children to this final inheritance, but also working to bring the whole physical universe to share that glorious redemption.

3. Some conclusions as to how the Spirit works. Perhaps it would be well in this connection to mention three principles that come out clearly in the New Testament with reference to the work of the Spirit in our salvation.

[1]Rom. 8: 24. [2]Eph. 1: 13, 14.

It has already been pointed out that all the work of the Spirit has reference to the person and work of Christ. If we keep this in mind we will see that it involves the three following principles:

(1) First, the work of the Spirit is to make real in us what Christ wrought out for us. Christ wrought redemption objectively for us; the Holy Spirit works redemption subjectively within us. This does not mean that the Holy Spirit had nothing to do with redemption as objectively accomplished in history, for we have seen that Christ in effecting redemption for us was under the control and guidance of the Spirit. Nor does it mean that Christ has nothing to do with redemption as subjectively realized in our experience, for it is by our appropriation of Christ by faith that we experience the transforming power of his redemption. But it does mean that, independently of our faith in him, Jesus Christ wrought out in human history an objective redemption for all men, and that this redemption becomes efficacious in us when under the power of the Spirit we appropriate Jesus Christ and his redemption. The universal objective provision then becomes our individual possession. Christ then becomes a transforming power within us. We can then say with Paul, "Christ liveth in me."[1] The work of making Christ to live in us is the work of the Holy Spirit in our salvation.

(2) This carries with it a second principle, namely, that the truth of the gospel is the means used by the Spirit in our salvation. The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation.[2] Peter says we were "begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God which liveth and abideth."[3] Paul says that salvation is by believing; but faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.[4] To say that God could not save a sinner without

[1]Gal. 2: 20.
[2]Rom. 1: 16.
[3]1 Peter 1: 23.
[4]Rom. 10: 10ff.

the use of human agency or external means of any kind might be going too far. But to say the least, God's ordinary means of saving men is by the use of such means in communicating to the sinner a knowledge of Christ and his saving power. But it is only as the Spirit gives efficacy to the gospel that it can save any man. The gospel simply as objective fact or a system of truth can not save. The sinner's heart and mind must be quickened by the power of the Spirit to see and appropriate the gospel before the gospel can become efficacious in the sinner's salvation.

(3) A third position that this implies is that man is left free in his acceptance or rejection of the gospel. While the Spirit gives efficacy to the gospel, this does not imply any kind of magical or non-moral action of the Spirit upon the sinner's nature or faculties in bringing the sinner to an acceptance of the gospel. The Spirit's action upon man is not of that nature. Man is never more truly at himself than when he acts under the power of God's Spirit. In fact it is only when he comes under the power of the Spirit that he is at himself. Sin separates from God; the Spirit unites to God. When man is under the dominion of sin, he is not his true self; when God possesses him by his Spirit he comes to himself.

Man's intelligence, his sensibilities, his freedom of choice are not destroyed or perverted in the Spirit's dealings with him in the gospel. His intellect is enlightened to know the truth, his sensibilities are quickened to respond to the truth, his will is liberated to act on the truth. The Spirit is not a power alien to man's nature; it is in the creative and preserving power of God's Spirit that man lives, and moves, and has his being. So when the Spirit by the gospel acts on man to regenerate and sanctify him, he is only bringing man to his true goal and destiny in God.

4. The Spirit's work in qualifying us for service. Most

of what we have had to say concerning the work of the Holy Spirit has had to do with our salvation. But the work of the Holy Spirit is not only to save but also to qualify for service. This phase of the work of the Spirit needs fuller consideration.

(1) We will notice some of the terms that are used with reference to this phase of the Spirit's work.

a. One is the term "baptism in the Spirit." This term is used by John the Baptist in telling what Jesus would do.[1] It is also used by Jesus.[2] These predictions of Jesus and of John were evidently fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, although, in describing that event, Luke does not use that term. Peter refers to the promise of Jesus as having been fulfilled in the case of Cornelius and his household.[3] Possibly Paul also refers to baptism in the Spirit in 1 Cor. 12: 13. Of course this expression is a figure of speech. In several cases it is contrasted with baptism in water. Christ is the one who baptizes in the Spirit. The idea sems to be that as one baptized in water is submerged in that element, so one who is baptized in the Spirit is submerged, overwhelmed, in the divine presence. It might be worth while to note that the expression in the New Testament is always baptism *in* the Spirit, never baptism *of* the Spirit. The agent is always Christ, not the Spirit. The Spirit is the medium or sphere in which we are immersed.

It is a debated question as to whether Christians today can claim the experience described by this expression. There seems to be no more reason from the New Testament record for limiting this expression to the New Testament age than there is for limiting such expressions as "filled with the Spirit" and "endued with power." Some hold that it should be limited to New Testament days because it was so closely identified with speaking in tongues and other miraculous manifes-

[1]Matt. 3: 11, 12; John 1: 33. [3]Acts 11: 16.
[2]Acts 1: 5.

tations. But a reading of the book of Acts will show that such manifestations are just as closely associated with the term "filled with the Spirit" as with the expression "baptized in the Spirit."

b. Another term is to be "endued" or "clothed" with divine power. This expression Jesus uses in Luke 24: 49.[1] This promise was fulfilled at Pentecost. The idea seems to be that power for service is something bestowed from without as a sovereign gift. It is distinctly not of man. It is something that takes possession of man and uses him, not as he wills, but as God wills, It is given, withheld, withdrawn at the divine pleasure, and without it man is entirely helpless in God's service. Note this in the Old Testament.[2]

c. Another expression is that of being "filled with the Spirit." This is a common expression in the New Testament.[3] This expression calls attention to the inner work of the Spirit and possibly also to the more personal characteristics produced by the Spirit. It is connected with such inner and personal qualities as being filled with joy, faith, wisdom, etc. It also seems to denote the raising of the individual's powers to the "nth" power, his being charged to the limit of his capacity with the divine presence and efficiency. In some cases it seems to denote a continuous state and permanent characteristic of the person, as in the case of Barnabas in Acts 11: 24, and Paul's command in Eph. 5: 18. In other cases it denotes a special possession of the individual by the divine power to meet a special need or temporary exigency.[4]

d. We find also the terms "poured out," "shed forth," etc., with reference to the bestowment of the Spirit.[5]

[1]Cf. Acts 1: 8.
[2]Judges 3: 10; 14: 6, 19; 15: 14; 1 Sam. 10: 10; 11: 6; 16: 13, 14.
[3]Luke 1: 41; 1: 67; 4: 1; Acts 4: 8; 6: 3; 7: 55; 9: 17; 13: 9, 52; Eph. 5: 18; *et al.*
[4]Acts 4: 8, 31; 13: 9.
[5]Joel 2: 28, 29; Acts 2: 17, 33; 10: 45.

This suggests the freedom and fulness of the bestowal here represented. Possibly the idea expressed is about the same as being anointed with the Spirit.[1] This anointing, especially in the First Epistle of John, is connected with an understanding of spiritual truth. The Spirit is our teacher in spiritual things.

e. Another term is the "gift of the Spirit."[2] This term calls attention to the freshness of the bestowment. It is not something earned or deserved, but is received as a gift.

There are other terms used in the New Testament, but these are sufficient for our purpose. In regard to these and other terms, we must be on our guard against considering them as scientific terminology with technical and rigidly fixed meanings. They are not the language of science nor of theology, as such, but rather the language of religious experience.

(2) An interesting question here is the relation of the work of the Spirit in salvation to the work of the Spirit in qualifying for service.

In the first place, we must remember that we can not draw a hard and fast line of separation. Salvation and service are inseparable. We are saved to serve. God gives the Holy Spirit to every man who believes in Jesus. When we believe we are sealed in the Holy Spirit. When Paul met some people who had been baptized but who had not received the Holy Spirit, he baptized them again. He did this no doubt on the ground that the man who did not know the Spirit, did not know Christ.[3] Receiving Christ is receiving the Spirit.

Sometimes it is said that we receive the Spirit by a distinct act of faith for consecration and service just as we received Christ for justification and salvation. This is misleading, to say the least of it. There is no reception of the Spirit apart from the reception of Christ; receiv-

[1] 2 Cor. 1: 21; Acts 10: 38; 1 John 2: 20, 27.
[2] Luke 11: 13; Acts 2: 38; 10: 45.
[3] See Acts 19: 1ff.

ing Christ is receiving the Spirit. This is not to say that one may not receive the Spirit in fuller power subsequent to regeneration. He may and should. But we should remember here two things. One is that receiving Christ in regeneration is a reception of the Spirit. One does not receive Christ without receiving the Spirit. The other thing is that any subsequent reception of the Spirit is a deeper consecration to Christ and fuller reception of him. Christ is always the object of faith rather than the Spirit. The Spirit is always the power that enables us to receive Christ. No man can call Jesus Lord save in the Holy Spirit.[1] Since the Spirit is the power that enables us to receive Christ, a reception of Christ is always an experience of the power of the Spirit in our lives. An appeal is sometimes made to Gal. 3: 2 to show that one receives the Spirit by faith, with the inference that we are to receive the Spirit in an act of faith distinct from a reception of Christ. But it is surprising how any intelligent reader of the New Testament ever got that impression; for Paul is clearly not speaking of a reception of the Spirit distinct from, and subsequent to, a reception of Christ, but is speaking of receiving the Spirit in receiving Christ.

Yet a man may be regenerated but not qualified for efficient service. Compare the apostles before and after Pentecost. So there seems to be a distinction between receiving the Holy Spirit in regeneration and receiving the Holy Spirit in power for service. Sometimes, no doubt, the two come together. This is perhaps the normal Christian experience. Yet in many cases in New Testament times and to-day they do not go together. The saved man is not always one that is largely useful. But what such a Christian needs is not to be told to receive the Spirit *in vacuo;* that is, without reference to his relation to Christ and his service to Christ, but rather that he should consecrate himself more definitely to

[1] 1 Cor. 12: 3.

Christ and his service and thereupon he may know more of the Spirit's power.

(3) Another question: Does this enduement of power for service come gradually or is it something that comes in a great crisis? It seems to come in both ways. Probably in most Christian lives that count for much in service, we will find both principles at work. There will be long periods of growth coming to a climax in a great crisis. Then begins another period of gradual development. Also many times a sudden crisis will arrest a period of reaction and back-sliding.

The idea, however, that spiritual power comes as a result of gradual growth may be so emphaszed as to lead Christians to think that it is something that will come of itself and hence discourage their seeking for spiritual enduement for service. It is something to be definitely sought and experienced, and Christians should not allow the extravagances of "holyrollerism" to prevent their seeking and finding it. On the other hand, the fact that it is something to be definitely sought should not prevent the use of the ordinary means for Christian culture and development or cause us to despise those who do not have "ecstatic" experiences. We should be careful about canonizing a certain type of spiritual experience.

(4) Again, is this enduement or infilling something that takes place once for all, or is it something that needs repeating? In general, the condition of the Christian ought to be one in which, as a regular and permanent characteristic, he is full of the Spirit. But there arise special crises and needs. Then the Christian may and should have a special infilling of the Spirit. Special need and responsibility call for special help from the divine presence and power. This the Christian may have if he looks to the source of all help. Especially do we need to remember that a past experience of the presence and power of the Spirit does not qualify for a present duty or task. God gives grace for living and service each day accord-

ing to the needs of the day, and we must trust him day by day to do so. He does not give grace and strength at one time for the rest of life. Daily need is met by daily grace.

5. The Holy Spirit in the church. We have been considering the Spirit in relation to the individual. But the Spirit works not only in the individual, but also in the community of Christians, or the church.

(1) The Holy Spirit constitutes or brings into being a church by bringing men into fellowship with one another in Jesus Christ.

We have seen that it is the work of the divine Spirit to regenerate men by bringing them into right relation with Jesus Christ through repentance and faith. Fellowship with God in Christ is thus created in the hearts of men. But where men have fellowship with God in Christ they have fellowship with one another. Where men have fellowship with one another church life is a possibility. In the very nature of the case, then, the members of the church must be regenerated people. You may have a religious organization composed of men and women not regenerated, but you cannot have a Christian church This shows that the center of the life of a church must be Jesus Christ. Men are drawn together because they are drawn to him. He is the central magnet.

The active agent in bringing the church into being is the Holy Spirit. A church of Jesus Christ is a product of the activity of the Spirit. As the Spirit constitutes the individual a Christian by bringing him into right relation with Christ, so he constitutes a company of individuals a church by bringing them into Christian fellowship. A church, then, is not simply an organization, it is an organism. It is a church by virtue of the fact that all the members possess a common life. The Christ who dwells in the church through his Spirit animates the whole body.

(2) The Holy Spirit bestows the gifts necessary for

the work and worship of the church.[1] a. One thing to be noticed here is the diversity of gifts bestowed by the Spirit. These are many and of many kinds. Some are natural, some are supernatural.

b. All of these gifts are for the upbuilding of the body, none was to be used for personal aggrandizement. They were given to each individual as a member of the body and were to be used for the common good. Some members of the body were more prominent than others, but all were necessary for the welfare of the body. Some gifts were more spectacular than others, but all were to be tested with reference to service in the upbuilding of the body.

c. The Holy Spirit is sovereign in the distribution of his gifts. He distributes to each man severally, as he wills. It is not left to any man to choose his gift or function in the body. This is the work of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit abides in the church as the sovereign administrator—as he is also in the kingdom of God. He fills the whole body with the divine presence and power. No matter what of organization and machinery the church may have, it is all of no avail unless charged with the divine presence. While some of the gifts bestowed by the Spirit seem to have ceased with the apostles, yet it is still true that the Holy Spirit is the great administrator of the church, and every church should seek his leadership and power. The greatest resource of any church is the resource of the divine presence. No problem which a church confronts is a hopeless problem, so long as the church has the divine presence and power to depend upon. We need to remember that the purpose of the Spirit's indwelling is to reveal the will of Christ as Lord to the church and to enable the members to do that will. The Spirit's work is to make Christ regnant in the church, and, through the church, in the world. The supreme question for any church, then, is its atti-

[1]See 1 Cor. 12 and 14; Rom. 12. Eph. 5: 18-20; 4: 1-16.

tude toward Jesus Christ and his will. By this is not meant the will of Christ as something to be suffered or endured, but as something to be aggressively acted out. The will of Christ is the law of the Christian's life—the purpose of the Spirit's indwelling. In the church he is to make that law effective in the church and in each of its members.

d. It is the Spirit's function to inspire and guide the worship of the church. The Spirit inspires the singing, teaching and whole worship of each Christian and of the whole body.[1] When the Spirit's presence fills the church, then it is that the fountains of praise and prayer and exhortation are opened up. There is then no coldness or dullness in the meeting. The church that makes out its program of worship without reference to the Holy Spirit forgets what worship is and what it is for. Oftentimes it is looked upon as a means of entertaining or pleasing the people rather than as a means of pleasing and adoring Christ as Lord and building up his body, the church. Woe to the church when the esthetic and the entertaining take the place of the spiritual in its worship! Only so much of the esthetic and entertaining should be allowed as will serve the ends of the spiritual.

We are not to infer from this that a church service will be spiritual by virtue of the fact that it is informal. A service may be carefully planned and intelligently directed and be spiritual. Spirituality is not synonymous with uncontrolled sentiment, nor with spontaneous combustion. God works through man's intelligence as well as his feelings. Paul says that God is a God of order, not of confusion.[2] But in all of the planning for a service and in the direction of it, divine guidance should be sought and spiritual aims and ends be kept uppermost.

[1] 1 Cor. 14: *26*; Rom. 8: *26, 27*; Eph. 5: 18-20; Acts 4: 31.
[2] 1 Cor. 14: *26-33*.

e. This suggests the question of the call to special forms of work in the church or kingdom. Beyond question this is taught in the New Testament. It would seem to be included in what has been said in reference to the Spirit's distribution of spiritual gifts and his sovereignty in their distribution. Paul's idea seems to be that each member had his place and function assigned by the divine Spirit. This would include the idea, then, of a call to the ministry, but it would include more than that. Some of Christ's gifts in the church and to the church are: apostles, prophets, pastors, etc.[1] Then we have the case of Paul and Barnabas in Acts 13. The Spirit calls them to a specific kind of work and selects their field of labor; and we recognize that the Holy Spirit is still to call the preacher or missionary and to call him to a specific field of labor. But how about the other members of the church? Does not the Spirit call each man to do some specific work in the Lord's service? Is not the will of God the law of life for every Christian as well as the preacher? Is it only the more prominent members of the body that are necessary? Does the Lord appoint the spheres of labor of the more prominent members and leave the others to choose their own places? Are we to have one law of life, one standard of consecration for the preacher and another for the other members of the church? The Spirit should guide the whole church, not simply the official force. The idea that officials or "clergymen" have a monopoly on a divine call and divine leading is the Roman Catholic idea, not that of the New Testament. In the New Testament there is no division of Christians into "clergy" and "laity." All are workers as the Spirit assigns to each his labor and gives grace to perform it.

[1] 1 Cor. 12: 28; Eph. 4: 11.

CHAPTER IV

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

I. Some general considerations.
   1. Relation to doctrines of deity of Christ and personality of the Spirit.
   2. New Testament statements of these doctrines.
   3. Religious interest in formulation of the doctrines.

II. New Testament facts bearing on the Trinity.
   1. Father, Son, Spirit, each is God.
   2. These three are distinguished.
   3. Christ and God are one.
   4. Holy Spirit and Christ are one.

III. Relation and work of three persons of the Trinity.
   1. Father source of all things.
   2. Son mediating agent in all things.
   3. Spirit completing agent in all things.

IV. Immanent and eternal Trinity.
   1. Sabellianism untrue.
   2. Social and moral life eternal in Godhead.

I. Some general considerations.

1. The doctrine of the trinity is inseparably connected with two other doctrines—the doctrine of the deity of Christ and the doctrine of the personality of the Holy Spirit. The great subject of controversy in regard to Christ has been the question of his deity. There has been practically no question as to his distinct personality. On the other hand, the point of controversy in regard to the Holy Spirit has been his distinct personality rather than

his deity. There has been little question that the Holy Spirit represented deity, the question has been whether or not the Holy Spirit was a person distinct from the Father and the Son.

In the order of time, as well as in the order of logic, it would probably be true to say that the doctrine of the trinity followed as a consequence of the recognition of the deity of Jesus Christ. When we come to recognize that Christ, in his work of salvation, was doing for men what none but God could do, we come to see that there was some kind of social life in the Godhead. This did not lead to polytheism nor to a surrender of the unity of God but to a recognition of life movement within the unity of the Godhead. Along with this recognition of the deity of Christ, went the belief in the personality of the Holy Spirit, so that Christians came to believe in a trinitarian life in the Godhead, rather than a dual life. These three doctrines, then,—the deity of Christ, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the trinity—are inseparably bound up together. Proof for one is proof for the others. If we accept the doctrine of the deity of Christ, the doctrines of the personality of the Holy Spirit and of the trinity will easily follow.

2. We do not have any formal statement of two of these doctrines in the New Testament. We do have an express statement of the deity of Christ, although even this is usually implied rather than explicitly stated. We have the way prepared for the acceptance of the personality of the Spirit and the trinity in the inculcation of the doctrine of the deity of Christ. We also have the material for the formulation of these doctrines. The New Testament contains these doctrines, but they are rather in solution. They have not yet been crystallized into formal statement.

3. It is frequently asserted that the formulation of these three doctrines in the creeds was due to a specula-

tive interest, the source of which was to be found in Greek philosophy, rather than due to a religious interest. These doctrines, therefore, it is said, represent a perversion of Christianity rather than a legitimate development. No doubt Greek philosophy furnished the thought forms for the statement of these doctrines as we have them in the creeds, but the controlling motive in their formulation was, nevertheless, religious. It was felt for instance that, unless Jesus Christ represented true deity, he could not save man from his sin. The problem of sin was felt to be too serious a matter to be entrusted into the hands of any being other than God. And since Christ did solve the problem of sin in man's life, man said he must, therefore, be God. Athanasius and others who opposed the doctrine of Arius felt that the vital interests of Christianity were at stake. They were not dividing Christianity over a diphthong, they were distinguishing between trust in Christ as God for salvation and reverencing him as a dignified creature—yet only a creature.

II. **Certain New Testament facts bearing on the question of the trinity.**

1. Father, Son, Spirit, each is recognized as God.[1]

2. These three are distinguished from one another.[2]

3. Christ and God are so related that where Christ is there God is, and what Christ does God does.

4. The Holy Spirit and Christ are so related that where the Holy Spirit is there Christ is, and what the Holy Spirit does that Christ does.

The Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ as well as the Spirit of God.[3]

The Lord is the Spirit.[4]

Christ is present in and through the Spirit.[5]

[1]Eph. 1: 3, 17; John 1: 1; Rom. 9: 5; Acts 5: 3, 4.
[2]2 Cor. 13: 14; Matt. 28: 19; John 14: 16.
[3]Rom. 8: 9.
[4]2 Cor. 3: 17, 18.
[5]Matt. 18: 20; 28: 19; John 14: 18.

Christ dwells in the believer through the Holy Spirit.[1] Are we not warranted, then, in drawing the conclusion that we have here trinity in unity, one God with three personal distinctions within the Godhead?

III. **The relation and work of the three persons in the trinity.** With reference to the place of the three persons in the trinity Dr. Strong sums up the matter as follows: "God exists in the relations, respectively: First of source, origin, authority, and in this relation is the Father; Second, of expression, medium, revelation, and in this relation is the Son; Third, of apprehension, accomplishment, realization, and in this sense is the Holy Spirit."[2]

He also sums up the characteristic differences between the work of Christ and of the Holy Spirit in four statements, as follows:

"1. All outgoing seems to be the work of Christ, all return to God the work of the Holy Spirit.

2. Christ is the organ of external revelation, the Holy Spirit is the organ of internal revelation.

3. Christ is our Advocate in Heaven, the Holy Spirit is our advocate in the soul.

4. In the work of Christ we are passive, in the work of the Spirit we are active."[3]

This means, then, that in all God's work (creation, preservation, providence, redemption) Christ is the mediating agent, while the Holy Spirit is the completing, perfecting agent. Christ is universally the medium of the outgoing of the energy of God. It is not strictly true to say that God is revealed in nature and in Christ, for nature is the work of Christ. He is the principle and medium of revelation in nature as well as in the historical Jesus. He lights every man that comes into the world. The world was made through him, yet when

[1]Eph. 3: 16, 17.
[2]"Sys. Theol.," Vol. I, p. 339.
[3]Rom. 8: 9-11.

he appeared it knew him not. So is the Old Testament the work of the Spirit of Christ, as well as the New Testament. In like manner is the Holy Spirit the agent who brings to perfection all the works of God in nature, as well as in the realm of grace. He is God immanent in creation, and bringing it to its predestined goal. Is it not the Spirit who causes creation to groan as it waits to be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God?[1] It is the Spirit that makes the sons of God to groan as they wait for the redemption of the body. It is also the Spirit that is leading the sons of God and bearing testimony with their spirits that they are the children of God. Is not the inference almost irresistible that the groaning of creation is due to the indwelling of the Spirit as he strives to bring the whole creation, as well as man, to the glorious destiny for which God intended it?

IV. **The distinctions immanent and eternal, not merely economic and temporal.** We must be careful not to interpret the work of the trinity in the "modalistic" or Sabellian manner. This doctrine says that God is only one person, but that this person is manifested in three different relations, or with reference to three different functions. It says that God as Creator is Father; as Redeemer from sin is the Son; as immanent in the church, sanctifying men, is the Holy Spirit. But this would lead to the absurd conclusion that when God became the Son he ceased to be Father, and when he became the Holy Spirit he ceased to be Father or Son. It would lead to the idea that the Holy Spirit was in our hearts teaching us to call God Father, when, as a matter of fact, God had ceased to be Father. Especially would this objection hold if we went as far as the Sabellians to hold that these three relations or characters of deity were historically successive, and that one did not

[1]Rom. 8: 18-22.

begin until the other had ceased. If it be replied that God might exist in all three relations at the same time, there still remains the objection that the idea of fatherhood as applied to God is primarily a redemptive relationship, not a creative one. God is Father not because he creates, but because he redeems through Christ. The fatherhood of God is not clearly revealed in the Old Testament; it only comes out in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ as Redeemer. All three of these terms —Father, Son and Spirit—get their peculiar significance for us in the New Testament, not in the Old. In the Old Testament, we have the revelation of the unipersonal God. In Christianity we have such a revelation of the character and work of God as carries with it the conclusion that there must be distinctions within the Godhead that our word person comes nearer describing than any other term.

This means that the idea of succeeding "dispensations" for the three persons of the trinity is liable to be misleading, if it is not fundamentally wrong. The idea, for instance, that the Old Testament was the age or dispensation of the Father, the time of the earthly life of Jesus the dispensation of the Son, and from Pentecost on the age of the Spirit is wrong. It is wrong because the fatherhood of God is revealed only in the revelation of the Son of God and because we know the Son only in the work of the Spirit. The idea of successive dispensations is easily grasped and has truth in it. There is a progressive revelation of the character and work of God. Especially are there the two great divisions represented by the Old and New Testaments. But if we identify these successive dispensations with the persons of the trinity, the idea is wrong for the reason just given. Father, Son and Holy Spirit in the Christian revelation are correlative terms. Each implies the others rather than succeeding and supplanting the others. Each per-

son of the trinity is involved in all the work of God—Father, Son and Holy Spirit create, preserve, govern, guide, and save together, not one to the exclusion of the others.

This co-ordinate work of the trinity in relation to the universe, physical and moral, is possible because there is an eternal life in the Godhead itself that is social and moral in its nature. For instance, fatherhood and sonship are not something accidental and incidental in the life of deity, but God is eternally Father and Christ is eternally Son. The love of the Father has eternally gone out to the Son, and through the Spirit, the love of the Son has eternally returned to the Father. Otherwise the revelation of God as Father is not a true revelation of the nature of deity, but is simply the display of a part assumed in time. If that be true, we have no real revelation of God. But according to the doctrine of the eternal immanent trinity, God is first the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and he is our God and Father in him. Our relation to him as sons is based on the eternal, archetypal relation of the uncreated Son of God to the eternal Father.

PART THREE

The Christian Doctrine of the World and Man

CHAPTER I

GOD AND THE WORLD

I. God created the world.
   1. Evidence that this is true.
      (1) Scripture teaching.
      (2) Religious consciousness and Christian experience.
      (3) Fact of redemptive program in world.
   2. God's purpose in creating.
      (1) World created for redemptive ends.
      (2) World created for glory of God.
   3. Objections to doctrine of creation.
      (1) Origin of world referred to impersonal force.
      (2) Matter and spirit not connected.
      (3) Material world eternal.
      (4) Eternal creation.

II. God preserves the world.

III. God transcends the world, yet is immanent in it.

IV. God governs the world according to natural law but may use miracle.
   1. Terms defined.
      (1) Natural law.
      (2) Supernatural.
      (3) Miracle.
   2. Nature and possibility of miracles.
      (1) Nature of miracles.
      (2) Possibility dependent on theism.
   3. Place of miracles in Christianity.
      (1) Miracles necessary.
         a. Resurrection of Jesus.
         b. Supremacy of God.
      (2) Evidence for miracles of Jesus.
         a. Gospel records.
         b. God's redemptive purpose.
         c. The person of Christ.
         d. Experience of grace.

We propose in this chapter to consider the relation of God to the world. By the world we mean here the material world or creation below man. What is the relation of the world to God? If we live in a universe the parts must be related to one another. If there is a God, especially if he is a God of absolute power and knowledge, then there must be a relation of a peculiar kind between him and all else that exists. The religious consciousness has always explained the world by referring it to God. This seems to be the spontaneous conviction of man's mind as religious. This is often also the conclusion reached by philosophic thought, though not always. It is clearly the view of the Old and New Testament Scriptures.

I. **God created the world.**

1. Evidence that this is true. To be more specific the Bible explains the origin of the world by referring it to the creative act of God. Back of the world it places God. The world, the whole material universe, it refers to God's creative power.[1] Whatever may be said as to whether the word translated "create" in Gen. 1: 1 means to bring into existence without the use of pre-existing material or not, the account as a whole indicates that this was the writer's conception of the matter. Evidently he thought of the world as coming into existence because God willed it. After the material universe has been willed into existence, there is a process of development in which higher forms of being and life appear until we get to man as the climax of the process. Each step in the process of development, as well as the first originating act, is referred to God. It is a mistake to try to find in this account a scientific description of the origin and development of the world. It is not a scientific account. Unnecessary difficulties have been found in trying to find here a scientific or an

[1]Gen. 1: 1ff; Col. 1: 16; Heb. 11: 3.

unscientific account. It is written from the standpoint of religion. It is a religious explanation in that it has in view the religious understanding of the world and the interests of the religious life. But it must be insisted that from the religious point of view it is a valid account. The world is regarded as originating in a creative act of God. The development of the world with its different orders of life is referred to God. Every form of life that appears is referred to God's creative and directing power. Any view that contradicts this, whether scientific (so-called), philosophic, or religious, is to be rejected.

This view of Scripture is confirmed by man's religious consciousness with its sense of absolute dependence on God. This sense of dependence is fulfilled in Christian experience in that man finds God in Christ and knows him as a creative power. In Christ man experiences creative power in the moral and spiritual realm. It is a natural and easy inference that this creative power which works in man's moral and religious experience also works in the material world and is the cause of that world's origin and development. This would seem to be necessary if we are to hold to a universe. If the power that is creative in the highest realm is not also creative in the lower, then the unity of the world is destroyed.

The same thing appears from a slightly different point of view. The fact that God is carrying out a redemptive program in this world is evidence that the world originated with him. If the world is suited to the carrying out of such a redemptive plan, then the power that carries out that program must be the power that originated the world. That God is carrying out such a redemptive program is not a debatable question with the Christian. It is a matter known in experience as well as by the testimony of the New Testament and of Christian history.

II. **God's purpose in creating.**

(1) The world created for redemptive ends. The fact that the world is the scene of the enactment of such a redemptive program also throws light on God's purpose in creating the world. The world was made for redemptive purposes. Man is the climax of creation. Creation is to be understood only from the standpoint of human life. The world was made for man. But human life can be understood only from the standpoint of God's redemptive purpose. Creation and redemption are parts of one great plan and program on the part of God.

This agrees with John's and Paul's view that creation took place in and through Christ.[1] Christ is also the goal of creation; all things are unto him as well as in and through him. See also Rev., chapters 4 and 5, in which the hymn of creation is followed by the hymn of redemption. God's creative power, as well as God's redemptive power, was exercised in Christ. Christ is the mediating agent in creation as well as in redemption. Christ becomes thus central for our view of the world. It is not an accidental or an incidental matter that he is put as the mediator of God's creative activity by the New Testament writers. After experiencing his redemptive power it was necessary if their view of the world order was to be unified.

(2) The world created for the glory of God. This throws light upon another question. Many theologians have held that God's motive in creating the world was his own glory. This was maintained on the ground that since the world did not exist the motive must be in God himself and on the further ground that to find God's motive in the created world would make God dependent on that world and this could not be allowed. This position was sometimes held in such a form as almost to make God a selfish being who created the world to ex-

[1]John 1: 1-3; Col. 1: 16.

ploit his own greatness and majesty without regard to the interests of the beings whom he might create. But even God must do right in relation to created beings. As to making God dependent on the world, if God realizes a purpose in the world order, then surely God is dependent on the world order for the realization of that purpose. But since the means that he uses to accomplish his end have their origin in himself, he is after all not dependent on anything outside of himself. If we remember that God's glory is no selfish exploitation of his own greatness, but consists rather in the impartation of himself to his creation in redemptive grace, thus glorifying himself primarily by blessing his creatures, then it is true that God's motive was his own glory. For creation finds its true end in redemption.

3. Objections to the doctrine of creation.

(1) The only other alternative, if the world had an origin, is to refer it to impersonal force. The only two kinds of forces that we know anything about are personal will and physical force. But physical force does not originate anything. It operates in a mechanical way. The result is always the exact equivalent in quantitative terms of the cause. But if we think of force as operating according to this law, we never get to any real origin. We have only change. This gives us the infinite regress. Physical force always operates according to the law of the transformation of energy. Motion may be converted into heat, heat into light, light into motion again, and so on. But the result is always the exact equivalent of the antecedent, nothing less, nothing more; nothing is lost, nothing is gained. But in the personal realm it is not so. Will does have the power to originate. This we know from our own experience. Personality is creative. The record of progress in human history is mostly a record of what creative personalities have accomplished. It seems more reasonable, then, to refer the

origin of the world to the will of an absolute personality than to refer it to physical force, for physical force originates nothing.

(2) The objection that matter and spirit are not connected. But it may be objected that there is no connection between matter and spirit to justify the idea that spirit or personality originated matter. It may be said that the only kind of force that we know as operative in the physical realm is physical and that we have no right to assume that personality is causative in this realm. But as a matter of fact, spirit and matter do exist in relation to each other. This we know in man's own experience. He is both body and spirit or soul. He has a material and a spiritual element united in one personal life. Moreover, in man's life we know the spiritual as controlling, directing the material organism. Besides, man as a personality acts upon the material world in which he lives. He injects himself as an intelligent will into his physical environment and produces results that physical causes alone could not account for. The essential element in the production of most animal and vegetable products, and even of those in the inorganic realm that count for human comfort and welfare, is the personal element. Wheat crops and fine breeds of cattle do not grow up out of nature of their own accord. The proposition that will can not operate as a cause in the material world will not hold. As a matter of fact will or personality is the only creative force that does operate there or anywhere else. If the world had an origin, then, it must have originated with a person; it could not have originated with physical force.

Man uses natural forces, then, for personal ends. He controls and directs those forces for his own purposes. He uses those forces to advance personal ends. This strongly suggests a personal source for those forces. How does it happen that personality finds here such a

world order that its forces may be used for personal ends? Is it more likely that such a world order just happened or that it was produced by a person for the uses and ends of personality?

(3) Did the world have an origin? But it may be objected that the material world had no origin. This is the position of materialism, pantheism and dualism. Materialism and pantheism have been previously discussed, and we have seen that neither allows a religious interpretation of the world or room for a religious life. The same thing is true of dualism. A religious view of the world, as well as a philosophic view, demands unity. Man's sense of dependence on God, especially his trust in God in Christian faith, is not consistent with a view of the world that runs an eternal cleavage through the universe. Religion is possible only in a world that is dependent on God. The doctrine of creation, then, seems to be necessary to religion. A world that did not originate with God can not be held to be dependent on him.

(4) The theory of eternal creation. A view similar to the pantheistic view is the view known as eternal creation. This holds that the world is distinct from God and is God's creation but that the universe did not begin to be. God has created it eternally. This was the view of Dr. James Martineau. He held this view as a means of avoiding the idea that God existed in eternity without any object of thought or activity. The trinitarian view avoids this difficulty in that the persons of the trinity may have fellowship among themselves. The view of eternal creation is in danger of making God as dependent on the world as the world is on God. This would have a decidedly pantheistic tendency. Besides a finite universe is not a sufficient object of thought and love for an infinite God. Moreover, it is a question whether the idea of an eternal creation is not a contradiction in

terms. It seems that that which is eternal would in the nature of the case be self-existent and uncreated.

II. **God preserves the world.** In thinking about the relation of the world to God we are concerned not only with reference to the origin of the world but also with reference to its continuance. Without reflecting we might think that all God had to do was to create the world and let it alone, and it continued to exist. Since it was in existence, it would continue unless God by a special act of his will blotted it out. But a little thought will correct this impression. The world could no more continue of its own accord than it could bring itself into existence at first. This is the view of the Biblical writers. They represent the preservation of the universe as being one of the specific functions of God in relation to the world.[1] Man's sense of dependence reënforces this teaching. And just as the doctrine of creation is necessary to a religious interpretation of the world, so is the doctrine of preservation. God could not carry out a redemptive program in a world that was self-operative and thus independent of him. The Christian view of the world, therefore, as the sphere in which God is working for the establishment of his redemptive kingdom necessitates the doctrine of his preservation of the world as well as the doctrine that he created it.

III. **God transcends the world, yet is immanent in it.** Creation and preservation imply two things with reference to God's relation to the world. One is his distinction from the world and transcendence over it; the other is his immanence in the world. If God creates and preserves the world, then God is distinct from the world and transcends it. God must not be identified with the world. He must not be swallowed up in his own creation. This is the great fault of pantheism. But if God is identical with the forces and processes of na-

[1]See Col. 1: 17; Heb. 1: 3.

ture, then he ceases to be God. A God who is not distinct from, who does not transcend the order of nature, is no better than nature. If he does nothing more than nature can do, then he is no other than nature. And it does not help the situation to call nature God or to write Nature with a capital N. The name does not change the thing.

On the other hand, it is just as great a mistake to shut God out of his world and make him exclusively transcendent. This was the mistake of deism. The world was regarded as having been created but then left to run itself by virtue of certain inherent forces. The world was looked upon as a kind of self-operating machine. God existed above and apart from the world. If he had anything to do with the world, it was by a kind of violent interference. He had nothing to do with the ordinary processes of nature. Christian theism avoids both mistakes. It holds to the immanence of God with pantheism and to the transcendence of God with deism. God is immanent in the world. The world is dependent on God. God can not preserve and guide the world unless he be immanent in it. He can not act where he is not. On the other hand, creation and preservation mean nothing unless God be transcendent. He does not create and preserve the world unless he is distinct from the world.

In practical result pantheism and deism come to the same thing on this point. If God be imprisoned in the world or shut out of the world, the practical result is that you have no God other than the world. You have a godless world.

We hold then: (1) That God created the world; (2) that God preserves the world; and (3) that God is, therefore, distinct from the world and transcends the world, but is immanent in it working out his purpose of redemption.

IV. **God governs the world according to natural law but may transcend that method by the use of the miracle.**

Natural law is God's method of working, but God is not limited to that method. He has worked miraculously in the past and may do so in the future. What has been said about the immanence and transcendence of God will help us to understand the question of the miraculous in God's relation to the world. We agree with pantheism as to God's immanence and will, therefore, hold that natural law is God's method of working in the world. We agree with deism that God is transcendent and will, therefore, not deny, as pantheism does, that God can work in a way that transcends natural law. While God works according to natural law, he is more than natural law. He is not to be identified with it. God is in his world, but he is not absorbed in it.

1. Some terms defined. Since the great objection to miracle is found in that general view of the world that insists on the invariability of natural law, we will approach the question from that point of view. We will, therefore, first ask,

(1) What is natural law? Natural law is a method according to which phenomena are related in the world around us. These phenomena follow one another in a definite relation. When some things take place, we know with reasonable certainty from past experiences that certain other events will follow. This enables man, to a certain extent, to forecast and control the course of events. On this account man can adjust himself to his environment and shape his environment to his ends. If the world were not a world of law, man could not live in it. He could not look ahead. He could not control the forces of nature so as to promote his purposes. He could not sow and reap. Everything would be topsy-turvy. The world of nature would not be a world at all. It would be a chaos over which death and desola-

tion would reign. The knowledge of what results follow certain antecedents, or what causes produce certain effects—this knowledge comes as a matter of experience and observation. A statement of the connection between antecedents and consequents or causes and effects, a statement giving the uniform relation among phenomena we call a natural law.

But strictly speaking, natural law does not define the force that is operative in nature nor tell us the nature of that force; it only describes the method of its operation. It is the function of science to tell us the method of the operation of this force, to show how the phenomena of nature are related in a casual sequence; it is the business of philosophy to tell us the nature of the force that is operative in nature. A statement, then, of a natural law is only the description of a method, not the definition of a force. This is not to be taken to mean that science, which traces the connection of phenomena, is an unimportant affair. For man's life in relation to his natural environment it is tremendously important. But it does mean that there are limitations on what science as such can tell us. For instance, it means that science can not tell us whether the power that operates according to natural law, or some other and higher power, may not operate in a way that transcends the uniformities of natural law. Science can not say, then, that the regularities of nature are absolute and inviolable uniformities. Science bases its generalizations on observation. To justify such a statement we would need not only a range of observation that was universal in the realm under consideration, but we would need also to know that there was no force or power in existence that could come into the realm concerned and vary the results. Such a pronouncement can not by any possible means be a scientific induction; it can only be a philosophical conclusion. A man has a right to an-

nounce such a conclusion in the name of philosophy, if he thinks he has good reasons for so doing; he has no right to pass off such a conclusion in the name of inductive science. Science may reasonably assume that the connections which it observes among phenomena are, within its range and for the purposes in hand, uniform and calculable. But to conclude that this uniformity is absolute and invariable for all time and in all relations is going further than science as such can go.

To put the matter another way, any science is necessarily partial and abstract. It arbitrarily, and necessarily, though justifiably, marks off a limited field and investigates the phenomena within that field. It traces certain observable uniformities of phenomena within its chosen field of investigation. It is justifiable in assuming that these uniformities are dependable within its field and for the purposes of its investigation. But to assume that these uniformities are absolute and invariable is not justifiable unless we have studied these phenomena, not only in the relations that obtain within that limited field, but also in their relations universally and for all time. But the very nature of any science precludes the possibility of such an investigation.

(2) Another thing that is evident at once is that life can not be reduced to the level of natural law, if natural law is to be taken in a sense that excludes conscious fellowship with God. Christian experience shows conclusively that there is a power higher than human that comes into the human and lifts it to a higher plane. In other words, Christian experience vindicates the claim of the supernatural in human life. A distinction is sometimes made between the supernatural and the miraculous, the supernatural applying to the realm of the spiritual or inner experience, the miraculous to the realm of the physical or that which can be observed by the physical senses. This distinction, however, is not easy to

maintain, and ordinarily we shall use the two terms as interchangeable. The supernatural in this sense is a matter of actual experience and can not be denied. Thousands of men by faith have realized the incoming of a new power that so revolutionized their lives as to leave no doubt in their minds that this power was the power of God. This power does no violence to man's mental and moral constitution. It is not supernatural in the sense that it is alien or foreign to man's nature. It is not contra-natural, but it is supernatural. It is recognized as a new power working results never before experienced in one's life.

(3) By the miraculous, strictly speaking, then, is meant an event in the physical or external world that clearly transcends natural law or is an open and palpable departure from the ordinary course of nature. It is not necessary that we be able to mark the exact border line between the natural and the miraculous. There may be events that it would be difficult to class as to whether they were miraculous or not. But that difficulty does not destroy the distinction between the natural and the miraculous. As an example of the miraculous, we might take the cases of raising the dead, the case of Jesus' walking on water, or the feeding of the five thousand. These and many others mentioned in the New Testament are clear examples about which there could be no question as to their miraculous character.

Let it be clearly understood that by miracle we do not mean the violation of natural law. Both the opposers and the defenders of miracle have argued as if a miracle were the violation of natural law. Natural law is not violated; it is transcended. This will doubtless be made clearer in the next section.

2. The nature and possibility of miracles. Any philosophical view that denies the possibility of miracles is a non-theistic view, a view that denies the existence of

a personal God. Whenever one admits the existence of a personal God, he thereby admits the possibility of miracles. If the fundamental reality of the universe is a personal God, on whose will all else depends, then there is no way of denying the possibility of miracles.

It does not matter, so far as this question of the possibility of miracles is concerned, whether one views the physical world in a realistic way as having an objective existence that is relatively independent of the divine will or whether he views the world with some idealists who regard natural forces as being the direct exercise of the will of God. In either case the world does not exist independently of the will of God; therefore, since the will of God is the underlying ground and support of the natural, the operation of the natural may vary if God wills it. According to the theistic view of the world, nature is not a self-operating machine; the processes of nature are dependent on God's will. The constancy of the divine will is the basis of the uniformity of nature. Independently of the divine will, there is no such thing as nature or natural law to be uniform.

Upon the theistic view, then, a miracle may be regarded as the injection of the will of God into the natural or human order in such a way as to bring about a result which would be impossible without this special injection of the will of God.[1] Since the will of God is the ground and support of nature, this is not to be viewed as a violent irruption of the divine into the natural realm. The natural order is not alien territory to God. The natural is a partial revelation or expression of the divine mind and will, but the natural does not so exhaust God that there can not be a fuller expression of himself. The miraculous is a fuller expression of the divine presence than the natural can express in its uniformity. The natural is God's ordinary way of

[1]Cf. Wendland, "Miracles and Christianity."

working; the miraculous is his unusual way of working. To say that God can not vary from his ordinary way of working is to deny his freedom.

The difference between the natural and the miraculous, then, is not a difference in the power that operates; it is a difference in the method of its operation and the purpose or end toward which it operates. Take, for example, the miracle of feeding the five thousand. The power exercised by Jesus in feeding the multitude is the same power of God that feeds the millions of earth daily. This power operates every day in the growing of wheat, the grinding of the mill, the baking of bread and a thousand other processes necessary to feed the hungry multitudes of earth. In the miracle wrought by Jesus the divine power operated in a more direct manner to create bread without the ordinary processes and means. We become so accustomed to the ordinary processes that we think they go on within their own right without reference to God. But God is in the natural as truly as in the miraculous. If not, why should we thank God for daily bread? If he does not furnish us with daily bread, then let us thank nature or the process or our own power and wisdom.

On this point, the relation of man to the inorganic and the organic realm below man furnishes us with an instructive analogy. Man injects his will into the realm below the human in such a way as to produce results that nature without man could never produce. The whole of human life in relation to nature is an illustration of this. We see examples of this in the growing of a crop, a garden, and especially in the development of new and higher varieties of vegetable and animal life. The development of fine breeds of cattle, horses, hogs or dogs, is not something of which nature is a sufficient explanation. It takes nature plus man. But the natural is not violated. Nor is it violated in the case of

miracle. In the case of a miracle a power above the natural or human is at work, or to put it another way, God's power works in a different way.

A miracle, then, is essentially a creative act. It is the coming of the divine in a new way into the natural or the human. If man can impose his will on the sub-human realm in a way that is essentially supernatural to that realm, surely God can do the same for the natural (including the human). In the case of miracles like the incarnation and the resurrection of Jesus, the results are permanent and revolutionary in human history. In the case of miracles like the feeding of the five thousand and walking on the water, the results are more temporary and didactic. The creative element is more easily seen in the former class than in the latter.

We have dwelt on the nature of a miracle in connection with the question of its possibility, because our belief in the possibility of a miracle depends very largely on our conception of the nature of a miracle. If a miracle is thought of as the coming of a power foreign to the natural realm into the natural and violating its order, we will not likely be favorable toward the idea of a miracle. On the other hand, if we look on the will of God as being the underlying ground of nature, we can not deny the possibility of a miracle. Such a denial can be made only on the assumption that nature is a realm independent of the will of a personal God. Such an assumption is incompatible with a theistic view of the world. Only an atheistic view of the world, then, can deny the possibility of miracles. This is not a scientific question; it is a question for philosophy and theology. It is a question the answer to which is fundamental to religion.

Especially would it seem reasonable to hold that the will of God might vary the uniformity of natural law unless natural law is the complete expression or revela-

tion of some rational or moral necessity. Mathematical axioms seem to be the expression of the rational nature of God. The moral law seems to be a revelation of the moral nature of God. On the theistic view, to hold that natural law is invariable we would have to hold that nature is not only a revelation of the rational and moral nature of God, but a complete revelation of that nature. To hold that the natural order is the complete revelation of God would be to identify him with the natural order. This would be equivalent to denying that there is any God apart from nature. So that we are led again to the conclusion that only on an atheistic view of the natural order, a view that assumes that the natural order is the expression of ultimate reality for us, can we affirm that a miracle could not take place. To affirm dogmatically that miracles are impossible one would have to know enough about the inner nature and constitution of the universe to be sure that there was no God, that the natural order was all.

3. The place of miracles in Christianity. We will now turn our attention to the miracles of the New Testament, especially the miracles of Jesus. We confine ourselves to the miracles of Jesus because of their central importance and because, if the question of the miracles of Jesus is settled, that establishes at least the principle that God is not limited to the method of natural law in his working in the world. If the miracles of Jesus stand, this is sufficient to establish the miraculous character of Christianity as a religion.

(1) Is it necessary to maintain that Jesus worked miracles? Is the miraculous element necessary in Christianity? Many people to-day affirm that it is not. Some maintain that this is true in view of the distinction, noted above, between the miraculous and the supernatural. The supernatural as the coming of God into human life in regenerative power bringing man into fel-

lowship with God is necessary, it is maintained, but the miraculous in the physical world is not. This gives room for the value of Christianity as a religion of redemption, but avoids the conflict with the "scientific" interpretation of the world which insists on the absolute invariability of natural law.

But this position can not be accepted for at least two reasons. One is the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus. The New Testament makes his resurrection fundamental to Christianity. Without the resurrection of Jesus Christianity could not be. If Jesus did not rise from the dead, Christianity is nothing but a sham. It is the risen Christ that saves from sin. It is fellowship with him that is the essential principle of the regenerate life of believers. On the other hand, if Jesus did rise from the dead, this fixes the character of Christianity as a religion of miracle. Miracle is an essential part of that religion. And by the resurrection of Jesus is meant that his body revived and came forth from the tomb. Certainly it means more than that, but it means nothing less than that.

This brings us to the second reason; namely, because, if we admit the supernatural and deny the miraculous, we admit God's sway over the spiritual world, but make a godless natural law supreme in the physical world. Especially is this true if we deny the possibility of miracle. This divides the universe into two mutually exclusive parts and gives us a form of practical, if not theoretical, dualism.

What is said in the next section on the supernatural character of grace has its bearing on this question.

(2) Let us look at the evidence for the miracles of Jesus. We need to remember that this is a many-sided question, one that needs looking at from many points of view. We are not apt to get at the truth if we settle it

one way or the other by a wave of the hand or an appeal to a simple formula.

a. One thing in favor of the miracles of Jesus is the fact that the miraculous element is so deeply embedded in the Gospel narratives that it is impossible to remove the miraculous element and leave anything of value in the accounts. The effort to get back to a non-miraculous Christ has signally failed. No matter how minutely the Gospel records are analyzed, the character of the Christ we get in every layer of the deposit is essentially the same. The Jesus who is only a religious and ethical teacher, with the miraculous element left out of his life, has never been found except in the imagination of some critics who superimpose their views on the Gospel records. On any sane criticism of the Gospel records, the miraculous element in the life of Christ remains.

b. Whether we view miracles as a possibility will depend mainly on whether or not we accept the theistic view of the world; our belief in the probability of miracles will depend largely on viewing them in relation to God's redemptive purpose. If we consider miracles as bare marvels unrelated to any great moral and spiritual purpose of God, we will not likely be inclined to accept the view that miracles have occurred. But if we see them as vitally related to a great plan of God to redeem man from sin, we will not likely be incredulous as to their occurrence. Jesus constantly refused to work miracles as a means of satisfying the demands of curiosity mongers. The miracles of Jesus were a constituent element in his revelation of the good will of God to sinful and suffering humanity. They were not mere exhibitions of power; they revealed the love and mercy of God. They were the natural outflow of the compassionate heart of the Son of God. Dr. Mullins calls attention to the fact that the miracles of Jesus are restorative

in character.[1] They are not a violation of order; they are rather a factor in God's plan to restore the moral order of the world. His miracles were largely miracles of healing, casting out demons, etc.—deeds that are aimed at the destruction of the works of the devil and the bringing of moral order out of moral chaos.

If the uniformities of natural law are God's method of working, and there exists an evil situation that can be remedied by a departure from the uniformities of natural law, then surely God will not hesitate to make such a departure. God's end is the making of righteous men and women. So far as the uniformities of natural law will serve that purpose, God will follow that method; but if that purpose can best be served by departing from the uniformity of natural law, then he will do so.

But the grace of God can not be revealed through the uniformities of law. The uniformities of law may reveal certain aspects of the divine character, but can not reveal his mercy and grace. Forgiveness of sins is something that nature can not reveal.[2] Hence there is needed for the revelation of God's redemptive plan a manifestation of God in the realm of human life that transcends the laws of nature.

c. Again, the miracles of Jesus can not properly be estimated except in connection with the Christian view of his person. Did Jesus work miracles? Our answer to that question will very likely depend on how we would answer another question, namely: Who was Jesus? If we regard Jesus as only a man, howsoever good and great, we may not be inclined to ascribe to him miraculous power. On the other hand, if we regard Jesus as being in a unique sense the Son of God, as being divine in a sense in which other men are not divine, as being the embodiment of God in human life, revealing God's final will for man, the supreme and final Mediator of

[1] "Why Is Christianity True?" pp. 180, 181.
[2] Cf. MacIntosh, "Person of Christ," p. 307.

God's redemptive grace to man, then we will likely not be averse to regarding him as possessing miraculous powers. If Jesus is a supernatural person, it would be natural for him to do supernatural works. Supernatural works are the natural expression of a supernatural person. And the Christian view of Jesus is that he is such a supernatural person. If he is not, there is nothing to Christianity and its claims. The claims of the Christian religion stand or fall at this point. Here there can be no yielding or compromise.

The supernatural view of the person of Jesus does not belong to the outposts of the Christian position; it is the citadel. If that is lost, all is lost. But if Jesus transcends the limits of ordinary human life, we would expect to see that manifested in his deeds. In fact such a manifestation of supernatural power would be essential to the conception of his supernatural person. Person and works go together. They are inseparable. This is not reasoning in a circle. But it is saying that the conception of the supernatural person and the supernatural works go together. One can not stand without the other.

To put it another way, Christianity is a religion of redemption. Jesus is Redeemer. He is not simply God's agent who tells us about the redeeming grace of God. He is the personal incarnation of God who embodies and conveys that grace. We do not simply trust the God he tells us about; we trust him as identical with that God. Redemption is a supernatural work. It is not limited to the spiritual phase of life to the exclusion of the physical. The physical is included. Jesus came to save the bodies of men as well as their souls. That is the meaning of the doctrine of the resurrection. Hence the Redeemer needs to be Lord of the physical as well as the spiritual world. This is exactly what we find Jesus to be. He stills the tempest, creates food for

the multitudes, cools the fevered bodies of men as well as giving them peace in their souls.

These nature miracles of Jesus may be regarded as prophetic. They may be regarded as promising the conquering of disease in the coming progress of Christian civilization and the subduing of the forces of nature to man's will and the furthering of God's great moral and spiritual plan for the race.

To view miracles, then, as bare marvels unrelated to God's redemptive purpose or the person of the Redeemer is to view them in a false light. The miracles of Jesus are an expression of God's benevolent purpose for man and an essential factor in the plan of redemption.

d. This brings us to a kindred point: namely, that an experience of salvation through faith in Christ gives us a predisposition in favor of the miracles of Jesus. When one experiences the nature-transcending power of Christ in the forgiveness of sins and in the power of his grace to conquer sin, then he does not have so much trouble on the question of the miracles of Jesus. One realizes in his own experience the climax of all miracles in the regenerating grace of God. In Christ Jesus he is made a new creature. One feels that if Jesus is Lord of the greatest of all realms, the personal and spiritual, he must be also of the outer and the physical. The physical exists for the sake of the spiritual. It serves the purposes of the spiritual. The Lord of the spiritual must be also the Lord of the outer and the natural.

CHAPTER II

THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF MAN

I. Man's origin.
- 1. Biblical doctrine of creation of man.
- 2. Man's relation to rest of creation.
  - (1) Material and animal basis of human.
  - (2) Climax and goal of creation.
  - (3) Man the lord of creation.
- 3. Theory of evolution in relation to creation of man.
  - (1) General considerations.
  - (2) Three attitudes toward biological evolution.
    - a. Atheistic evolution.
    - b. Theistic evolution.
    - c. Direct creation.
      Evidence for this view:
      - (a) Evolution not established.
      - (b) Scriptures favor direct creation.
      - (c) Creation and evolution exclude each other.
  - (3) Summary.

II. The nature of man.
- 1. Constituent elements in man's nature.
  - (1) Material and immaterial element.
  - (2) Trichotomous theory.
  - (3) Reasons for dichotomy.
- 2. Man a spiritual personality—powers of personality.
  - (1) Intelligence.
  - (2) Affection.
  - (3) Free will.
  - (4) Moral sense.
  - (5) Religious nature.
- 3. Man's original moral and spiritual condition.
  - (1) Neither civilized nor savage.
  - (2) Morally innocent.
  - (3) Positively inclined to right.
  - (4) Condition of happiness and fellowship with God.

Having considered the origin of the material world and its relation to God, it is now in order to consider the origin and nature of man. What was said about the world or order of nature in the preceding chapter was intended to apply to everything except finite personalities. It was intended to include vegetable and animal life. We come now to a consideration of the highest that man knows, man himself.

I. **Man's origin.**

1. The Biblical doctrine of the creation of man. The Bible attributes man's existence to the same source as nature below man; that is, to God. We are told in the first chapter of Genesis that God created man in his own image.[1] In the second chapter it is said that God formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul.[2] All the statements of Scripture imply that God is the source of man's being. While the whole world order is ascribed to God as its Creator, special emphasis is placed upon the creation of man. This comes out in the statements just referred to that man was made in the image of God and that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. Emphasis is placed upon the creation of man as a special order of being and the climax of the world order.

2. Man's relation to the rest of creation. Three things are to be noted with reference to man's relation to the rest of creation.

(1) The material and animal creation is the basis of the human. On the lower side of his being man is material and animal. He is dependent in the present order of existence on the material and animal. He could not exist in this world without a material basis.

[1]Vs. 26, 27. [2]V. 7.

(2) The impression from the Genesis account, as well as other statements of Scripture, is that man is the goal and climax of creation. Everything below man was made with reference to man and for man. All else was preparatory to his coming. Without him creation has no meaning, comes to no finality. The material and animate creation find no sufficient justification in themselves.

(3) Another thing that comes out clearly in the Genesis account is that man is, under God, the lord of creation. God gave man dominion over all that he had created. He was to subdue and replenish the earth, to bring its forces and resources into subjection to himself.[1] The whole of human history is, in one aspect of it, a struggle to fulfill this commission. This commission is not simply an external command. It is a law of man's being. It expresses itself in his scientific interest in the world around him, in his desire for geographical exploration and discovery, in his inventions by which he brings the powers and resources of earth and air and sea into submission to himself, overcoming the limitations of space and time to a great extent and the hostile forces of nature. Unconsciously men are working together to fulfill this commission of the Creator. This commission expresses itself in man's imperial power over the lower animals. Notwithstanding their greater physical power, there is not a one that man can not tame and make to do his will.

3. The theory of evolution in relation to creation. Perhaps it is in order here to say a word about the evolutionary view with reference to the origin of man. (1) Some general considerations. The term evolution is used with such broad and varied meaning that it needs further definition for an intelligent discussion. It is used with reference to the development of the material universe as well as with reference to the development of life on the earth. We are not concerned here particu-

[1]Gen. 1: 26ff.

larly with reference to the former or cosmic evolution but rather with the latter or biological evolution. With reference to the whole matter, it may be said that the Genesis account indicates on the face of it that there was a process of development both with reference to the material universe and with reference to life on the earth. In general, the Genesis account and science agree on that point. There is no way of telling from the Genesis account how long a period this process of development, coming to its climax in the appearance of man on the earth, occupied. The term "day" probably denotes a general period of indefinite length used to denote the completion of certain general phases or stages of creation.

(2) Three attitudes toward biological evolution. But we are concerned here more specifically with biological evolution. Our question is: Did man descend from an animal ancestry or did God create man *de novo?* In general there are three answers that are given to this question.

a. The first is that man evolved from a lower order of animal ancestry without God's creative power. God is ignored or denied in relation to the matter. It is held that by a purely evolutionary process without interference from God or any other force outside of nature, man developed from an animal ancestry. This is materialistic or pantheistic evolution. Of course the Christian can not accept this position nor compromise with it. It denies in toto the Christian view of the world.

b. A second position is that God created man but evolution was the process or method that he used. Again, there is a variation among those who hold this position. Some hold that man came from the animal on both the physical and psychical sides of his being; while some hold that man may have come from the animal on the animal side of his being but deny that he did on the higher side of his being. Again, there is a difference as

to God's relation to the process, some holding that God worked only from within, or exclusively from the standpoint of his immanence, while others maintain that there were transcendent factors in God's operation; that is, that God came in a supernatural or miraculous way into the process at certain points and started new forces or factors into operation. The former position would seem to come practically to the position of materialistic or atheistic evolution. A God who does nothing more than what nature does or who works only by natural methods is after all nothing but nature.

The latter position, namely, that God came into the process in a new or creative way at certain points, has much to make it plausible. Many earnest Christian men now hold the position and defend it. Especially is this true in case it is held that man came from the animal on the lower side of his being but not on the higher side. This is the position of Dr. A. H. Strong.[1] He says that on the side of his body man came through the brute but not from the brute. He means to say that God produced the body of man but used the animal as his medium. This position allows for continuity in God's plan. It also allows for whatever actual evidence there is for evolution. In the minds of many of its advocates it is possible to harmonize this position with the Genesis account of man's creation.

Against this view, it is objected that it lowers the dignity of man to hold that he came through an animal ancestry. But it must be allowed, on any view, that there is a good deal about man that is not very dignified. He is an animal on the lower side of his being, whether he came from an animal ancestry or not. He has the same appetites, diseases, weaknesses, many of the same instincts as the other animals. One holding this view might answer the objector by saying that on the physical side, if man did not come from the animal, he came from

[1] "Sys. Theol.," Vol. II, pp. 465ff.

lower down, from the dirt, and that the animal is about as dignified as dirt. Besides, the view allows for creative activity on God's part. God comes in a new transcendent way into the process and creates man. This accounts for the difference between man and the lower animal. One of the greatest difficulties of the view is that it does not satisfy the thorough-going evolutionist. He is not willing to accept the view, because it does not allow that man is a purely evolutionary product. The thoroughgoing evolutionist will not allow for any transcendent or miraculous activity to re-enforce the process. In other words, with him it must be all process and no God.

c. The third view is the one that man on both the lower and higher sides of his being is the direct creation of God; that God made man's body directly out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. This view the author holds for the following reasons:

(a) The evolutionary view has not been made out. Many scientists assume the evolutionary view as if the case were made out and the matter finally settled. But the missing link has not been found. The crucial point, namely, the development of an animal into a human, even on the physical side, is the very point where evidence is lacking. To assume the position as finally made out is to go beyond the evidence. It is easy enough to show kinship in some respects between man and animal and to show that there was probably a series of life historically developed on the earth leading up to man. But this does not prove that man grew up genetically from the animal. This series, including the likeness of man to the animal, may just as well be accounted for on the hypothesis that the series, including the likeness, expresses the purpose of God who guides and directs the whole process to an end. This point is well illustrated by what some one has called the evolution of the

modern jack knife. One might see in a museum a series of knives leading from the crudest knife known to research up to the modern jack knife. Here would be a long series leading by a process of gradual improvement to the climax. But this would not by any means prove that one knife grew up out of the other, but rather that there was a superintending intelligence guiding the process. That is to say, all the known facts can be accounted for on the non-evolutionary view, while the evolutionary view breaks down at the crucial point. At the very point where proof is needed to establish the evolutionary view, evidence is lacking.

(b) A second reason for holding the third rather than the second position is that the direct rather than the evolutionary method of creation is the obvious way of interpreting the Genesis account, if not the only consistent way. The impression of that account is that man was a direct creation of God. Man was formed from the dust of the ground. It might be possible to interpret this by saying that, while man's body came by descent from the lower animal, the ultimate source of the material was the earth. But the other is the more obvious interpretation. There is another phase of the Genesis account, however, which it is still more difficult to harmonize with the evolutionary view. That is the statement in Genesis that God made everything to reproduce after its kind. A thorough-going evolutionary view implies that there are no limits to the law of development. It implies that from the lowest germ of life up to man there has been an unbroken chain of ascent in the development of one form of life out of a lower by virtue of forces resident within the lower. The Genesis account provides for development in two respects. First, there is development in God's plan of creation as a whole from matter up to man. There is first the development of the material world, with its light and cosmic order. Then there is the appearance of lower forms

of life leading up to man as the climax. There is thus the unfolding of a progressive plan of creation. Then there is provision for the development of life within the limits of species. But the evolutionary view holds that there is no limit to the development of life from the lowest form up to the highest form of life known, the life of man. It holds not only that the limits of species have been crossed in the development of life from lower forms of life, but also that there was no limit to this crossing of the limits of species; that the limits were all crossed until man was produced. That is, the progress from lower to higher forms of life, noted above, coming to a climax in man, was not a progressive creation by a power above and distinct from the things created, but was the development of one form of life out of a lower form by virtue of forces resident in the lower, until we come to man. But here again, at the crucial point, the evidence fails and we have nothing but theoretical assumption. These limits have never been crossed within the observation or knowledge of any man. It all took place in prehistoric times and the process has never been repeated and nothing resembling the process.

(c) It seems, then, that the two sides of creation and of evolution are mutually exclusive. Creation denotes the bringing into existence of something that did not exist before on the part of a personal God who transcends the whole created order. Evolution denotes the development of a higher form of being from a lower by virtue of resident forces. But this can take place only where the higher existed potentially in the lower; that is, only where the higher was created in the lower. The kind of development spoken of in Genesis presupposes creation and is based on it.

(3) Summary. To sum up the matter, then, we can not for a moment admit the view of evolution that leaves God out and holds that without God's creative power or superintending guidance the universe came uncaused out

of nothing and has kept on evolving until it produced man. Nor is the view satisfactory which holds that man came from the lower animal, even though it is held that this process was God's method of creation. To the extent that this view is evolutionary, it ceases to be creative; and to the extent that it is creative, it does not satisfy the thoroughgoing evolutionist. The third view seems to account for all the known facts both of nature and Scripture and is a self-consistent account. Then why should it be rejected until further evidence is produced?

II. **The nature of man.** Having considered the origin of man, we take up now a question of equal importance, the nature of man.

1. The constituent elements in man's nature. The account of creation indicates that man is composed of a material and an immaterial element. We have had occasion several times to refer to man as being both physical and spiritual in his nature. He is composed of body and soul. This comes out in the account of his origin when it is said that God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul.[1] Here the writer seems to be giving an account of the two elements in man's being, the physical and the spiritual.

There is a theory which has been more or less prevalent since the days of Plato that man is composed of three elements rather than two. The authority of Scripture is sometimes claimed for this theory on the ground that soul and spirit are distinguished from each other and particularly on the basis of 1 Thess. 5: 23 where Paul prays that his readers may be preserved in body, soul and spirit and of Heb. 4: 12, where the writer says that the word of God penetrates to the dividing asunder of

[1]Gen. 2: 7.

soul and spirit. But we must remember that these writers are not aiming to give a scientific or metaphysical statement of the elements entering into man's being. Paul is giving in general terms a statement of man's whole being, while the writer to the Hebrews is using the two terms to denote man's innermost being. Jesus makes a statement as recorded in Mark 12: 30 in which he says that man should love God with all his heart, soul, mind and strength. But no one would say on this account that man's inner being should be divided into four elements.

In favor of the dichotomous view it should be noted that Jesus uses body and soul to include man's whole being;[1] also that he uses soul to denote the highest and most worthful element in man;[2] that the book of Revelation uses the term soul to describe disembodied martyrs.[3] The terms soul and spirit of course have somewhat different meanings. But that difference is not that they denote different metaphysical elements in man's being. They denote the same element but from different points of view. Possibly Dr. Strong's statement[4] sums the matter up about as well as any when he says that soul denotes the higher element in man's being when that element is looked on as inhabiting or capable of inhabiting a physical organism, while spirit denotes the same element as capable of communion or fellowship with God. He says man is not a three-story building but a two-story building with two windows to the upper story, one looking downward toward the body, the other looking upward toward God.

Our conclusion is, then, that man is composed of two elements, a material and an immaterial. The material we call the body. There are many terms used to describe the functions and relations of the immaterial, such as intellect, mind, heart, conscience, soul and spirit.

[1]Matt. 10: 28.
[2]Mark 8: 36.
[3]Rev. 6: 9.
[4]"Sys. Theol.," Vol. II, p. 486.

These terms do not denote separate metaphysical elements in man but rather different psychological functions or activities of man's inner life.

2. Man a spiritual personality. We are told in Genesis 1 : 26, 27 that God made man in his own image and likeness. What does this expression mean? It means that in some respect or respects man is like God. To find the answer to this question we might ask ourselves: In what respects is man like God? This question might be answered in a summary way by saying that man is like God in being a spiritual being or a person. To get a fuller answer to the question, we might look more fully into man's spiritual nature or activities. We find that as a spiritual being man performs a number of functions. Or, to put it another way, there are a number of powers that belong to man as a spiritual personality. What are some of the essential functions or powers that belong to man as a spiritual personality?[1]

(1) The first that should be mentioned is intelligence or the power to think. The lower animals possess this power in a very crude and elementary sense. Man has the power to know. The highest form of this power is found in the power to know one's self and to know God. Self-consciousness is usually put as one of the essential powers of personality. This denotes the power to make self an object of thought.

(2) The second thing is the power of rational affection. The lower animals have sensibility and instinctive affection. But man rises above the lower animals as much in his life of sensibility and affection as he does in his thought life. Rational love is the highest quality in God and in man. This highest quality in man's life is intelligent love that works deliberately and sacrificially for the good of its object. It is not blind sentiment or instinct, much less mere passion. It is the noblest attribute of God or man.

[1]On this section, cf Mullins, "The Christian Religion," p. 258ff.

(3) The third thing is free will. Man is a free being. He has the power of self-determination. He can be influenced but not forced. In this respect he is like God. God is the only perfectly free being in the universe. He is completely self-determined. He does all that he wills to do. Man's freedom is limited but real. He has the power to form ideals and then direct his energies toward the attainment of those ideals. He looks ahead and deliberately moves in the direction that he chooses to go. This power the lower animals do not possess. Their movements and activities are determined mostly by instinct. Man has instincts but his instincts are rationally controlled and his activities are, at least in part, deliberately willed.

(4) Another respect in which man is like God is in the possession of the moral sense. In the general use of the term, this is what is meant by conscience. Man has the innate sense of right and wrong. His ideas as to what is right and what is wrong are largely a matter of training and education. But the feeling that there is such a thing as right and wrong and that man is bound to do the right and avoid the wrong—this is practically universal. Since man is a self-conscious being and has this sense of obligation to do the right and avoid the wrong, he has the power to judge himself with reference to the moral quality of his deeds and to approve or disapprove them. He either condemns himself as wrong or approves himself as right. This power of self-judgment is properly what conscience denotes and is one of the highest qualities belonging to man. It is the thing that gives moral quality to his life, the thing without which his life would not possess moral significance. This moral sense seems to be wholly lacking from the life of the lower animals and belongs supremely to God. These four things—intelligence, particularly self-consciousness, rational affection, free will or self-determination and the moral sense or conscience—mark

him as being made like God as a personal being and hence made in God's image.

(5) As a consequence of the fact that he has these powers that mark man as like God, man has a spiritual affinity for God. He is a religious being. He knows God, and is not satisfied without him. He has an insatiable thirst for the infinite and the eternal. He can not rest until he rests in God. Any man who urges the claim of religion on the minds and hearts of his fellow men can count upon having on his side the deepest yearnings of the human soul.

3. Man's original moral and spiritual condition. Sometimes man's original condition of innocence and freedom from sin are given as a part of the divine image. Whether the term includes man's original condition or not, that question should be considered in connection with the origin and nature of man.

(1) The original condition of man was neither one of civilization nor of savagery. Some speak of man's original condition as if it were a state of the highest civilization, while others would identify it with a condition of savagery. But both civilization and savagery are developments. The account of origins in Genesis would not suggest that the first man was either civilized or savage. He had neither the virtues nor the vices of the civilized man, and certainly he did not have the vices of the savage.

So far as material civilization is concerned, man no doubt began at the bottom. There is not a shred of evidence that, when God created man, God handed him over a ready-made civilization. An inexperienced man would not have known what to do with it, if it had been given him. He hardly knows now after he has developed it for himself through centuries of toil and struggle. There seems to be a description in the fourth chapter of Genesis of the beginning of certain arts and handicrafts, which would indicate the beginning of material

civilization. It is certainly a mistake, then, to regard man as having been put on so high a plane that he could go no higher in material civilization, or to consider him as having been created in such a high moral and spiritual state that he could be lifted no higher by the redeeming grace of God.

On the other hand, he was not a savage. Some would place him so low morally and spiritually that he could not fall. This idea is usually associated with an evolutionary view of human history that regards the history of man as an unbroken ascent. Certainly there is no foundation in either history or Scripture for this view. Paul teaches in the first and second chapters of Romans that heathenism is the result of a down grade movement in which men refused the knowledge of God and were consequently plunged into deeper and deeper moral and spiritual darkness.

(2) Man's original condition was one of moral innocence. The Genesis account does not justify the idea that man began his moral and spiritual career in a high state of positively developed righteousness and holiness. The whole account is to the contrary. It gives the impression rather that man's original condition was one of innocence or moral childhood. How else could it have been? He had had no moral experience. Positive righteousness comes as a result of moral experience. It seems hardly possible that God himself could create a being with the highly developed moral character that comes only through moral struggle and victory. This is not to question God's almightiness. It is only to say that God does not do things that are inconsistent with his own moral purpose and the moral order of the world which he has created.

Man did not know from experience what was right and what was wrong. So he began his moral career as the child begins, by being told what to do and what not to do. This seems perfectly natural. How else could

he have begun? The fact, however, that God commanded him what to do and what not to do implies a sense of right and wrong. Without this the command would have had no meaning to him. Without this sense of right and wrong he would not have been human. He would have been merely animal and there could have been no moral development. Some insist that man began his career without any distinct sense of right and wrong and that this sense of right and wrong grew up in experience or out of experience. It is true that experience modifies or develops the moral sense and that out of experience man learns much as to what is right and what is wrong. But the sense of right and wrong is a part of his constitution as man. And without this any amount of experience through illimitable ages could never develop it. The germ of life has to be there before there can be growth.

(3) Man was positively inclined to the right. Nor is what was said above to be interpreted to mean that man had no moral tendencies or inclinations either toward the right or the wrong. It is claimed by some that God could not create a being with such positive moral inclinations. But the experience of regeneration shows this position to be unfounded. In regeneration God recreates man with positive inclinations toward the right. Man is recreated in the image of Jesus Christ. There needs to be growth in the divine life. But that life certainly has positive moral quality from the first. It is difficult to see how there could be a being with a moral constitution without positive moral tendencies or inclinations.

That man had such right moral inclinations is shown by the fact that before his disobedience he had communion and fellowship with Jehovah. Jehovah came and walked and talked with man in the garden.

(4) Man's condition was one of happiness and fellowship with God. The account also shows that man's con-

dition was one of innocent happiness. He was given charge of the garden and his work was to keep the garden. He was given companionship of his own kind, for God made him a help meet. In a state of innocence, with congenial companionship, with work to employ his hands and mind, with his needs adequately provided for, in fellowship with God his Creator, man began his moral career. A further discussion of some points of the Genesis account will be given in connection with the discussion of the first sin and its results.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN

I. The origin of sin.
   1. Man's condition.
   2. Agency of Satan in tempting man.
      (1) Objections to idea of personal devil.
      (2) Evidences for the view.
   3. How could a sinless being be tempted?

II. The nature of sin—three views.
   1. Sin as due to bodily appetites and instincts.
   2. Sin as weakness and limitations.
   3. Sin as rebellion against God.
      (1) The element of wilfulness in sin.
      (2) Sin as wilful implies knowledge.
      Stages of revelation in relation to sin.
         a. In nature.
         b. Through reason and conscience.
         c. Through law as moral requirement.
         d. Through grace.
      (3) Sin as unbelief.
      (4) Sin as violation of law and as personal offence to God.
      (5) Sin as guilt or ill desert.
         a. Terms in Bible.
         b. Man's consciousness of guilt.
         c. Ground of guilt.
         d. Degrees of guilt.
      (6) Sin as depravity.
         a. Meaning of term.
         b. Evidence for the doctrine.
            (a) Teaching of Scripture.
            (b) Universality of sin.
         c. Total depravity.
            (a) Man's whole nature depraved.
            (b) Man wholly unable to deliver self from sin.
            (c) Outside of grace becomes worse and worse.

III. Original sin.
1. A preliminary survey.
2. Augustinian and federal theories.
3. Race unity.
4. Individual responsibility and race unity.
   (1) Theoretical difficulty.
   (2) Facts bearing on the difficulty.
      a. We do have an inherited and social handicap.
      b. Yet we know ourselves responsible for our lives.
      c. Our inherited and social handicap may modify our guilt and responsibility.
      d. There is race redemption as well as race sin.
5. Conclusion as to moral condition and salvation of infants.
   (1) Child is sinful by nature.
   (2) Dying in infancy it is saved.
   (3) Objection that gospel light is dangerous.

IV. The penalty of sin.
1. Certainty and nature of penalty.
   (1) Penalty is certain.
      a. Taught in Old and New Testament.
      b. Not abrogated by grace.
      c. Guaranteed by holy character of God.
   (2) Penalty includes all loss due to sin.
2. Natural evil and penalty.
   (1) Natural and moral evil distinguished.
   (2) Some connection between the two.
   (3) Sin not the result of natural evil.
   (4) Much human suffering traceable to sin.
   (5) Inference from some Scriptures that all suffering due to sin.
      a. This is only an inference, not clear teaching.
      b. Suffering may have preceded sin in order of time.
      c. Not all suffering the direct penalty of sin.
   (6) Under grace suffering becomes redemptive in effect.
3. Death as penalty of sin.
   (1) Includes physical death.
   (2) Central thing is spiritual death.
   (3) Final penalty is eternal death.

Any discussion, religious or philosophical, that considers man in relation to God is incomplete that does not take account of the fact of sin. Much of the discussion in this realm misses the way because it either ignores or misinterprets sin. As preparatory to a con-

sideration of the doctrine of salvation we look at the doctrine of sin. We will first consider the Genesis account of the origin of sin.

I. **The origin of sin.**

1. Man's condition. We note in the first place, as stated in the previous chapter, that man was possessed of a rational and moral constitution, which made him a morally responsible being. At the same time he was in a state of moral innocency, being free from sin as he came from the hand of God. But he was also in a state of moral inexperience. The account makes this clear. He knew what to do or not to do only as he was commanded by Jehovah. God told him what to do and what not to do and warned him of the results of disobedience. As to man's condition, then, it is well to remember these three things: man had a moral and spiritual constitution, he was innocent, and he was in a state of moral inexperience.

2. The agency of Satan in tempting man. In the next place, we should remember that the temptation to sin came from without. The agent is represented as a serpent. The serpent here is to be taken either as the symbol or instrument of Satan. The Bible uniformly represents Satan as the one who entices man to sin.

Many people to-day deny that there is any personal devil. They hold that this idea of a personal devil is opposed to what they are pleased to call the "scientific" view of the world. But the question as to whether there is a personal devil or not is not one that properly comes within the range of scientific investigation. And as to the bearing of philosophy on the question the only principle that would exclude a personal devil is the principle that would deny all personal agency in the world and reduce the universe altogether to a system of impersonal forces. But this would not only exclude a personal

devil; it would also exclude God as a person and man as well. Such a view is intolerable in religion.

The idea is sometimes advanced that to attribute sin to the agency of the devil would be to lessen man's sense of responsibility for sin. But this is a mistaken notion. This is shown by the fact that it did not have this effect with the Biblical writers. No writers have ever shown such a penetrating sense of the guilt and power of sin, yet at the same time they looked upon sin as being due to Satanic temptation. The same thing is true with reference to Christians who believe in Satan. Instead of lessening their sense of the awfulness and ruin of sin, it has rather increased it. Such a man as Martin Luther is a good example. On the other hand, there is good reason to question at least if a disbelief in a personal devil does not have a decided tendency to make men view sin as a light thing. It is not against this view that the idea of a devil and evil spirits is to be found in other religions. The idea of a God is to be found in other religions. But we do not reject the idea for that reason. The agency of a powerful personal evil spirit would help to explain the power and persistence of sin in human life. It is said that the idea of a personal devil is to be attributed to the spontaneous tendency of the mind to attribute phenomena the cause of which is not understood to personal agency of some kind. This might be granted. The question is not whether the belief is to be attributed to such a psychological tendency, but whether that tendency is a trustworthy one, whether it leads us in the direction of truth or not. On other questions, such as the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, we usually say that a natural tendency of the mind, leading to a practically universal belief, is to be trusted. At least this would not be against the belief in a personal devil.

There are at least two things that favor the view that there is a personal devil. One is the existence,

power and persistence of moral evil in the world. That sin and sinners exist no one with the least moral perception can deny. But it is not only a question of accounting for sin and sinners, it is a question of accounting for the power and persistence of sin, for what seems to be a kingdom of evil. That there is such a kingdom of evil under Satan as the head is the view presented in the Bible. The thing that we insist on here is that there are certain phenomena which can best be accounted for on the hypothesis that such an evil personality exists and operates in human life to promote sin, destroy man and thwart the purposes of God.

Another argument for the idea is the uniform testimony of the Scripture writers in favor of the view. This includes the New Testament as well as the Old. It includes Jesus himself. We have a number of sayings from him which testify to his belief in a personal devil. We hold that the testimony of Jesus is worth more than that of all the moderns who deal in other realms and seem to think because they may know a little more about the binomial theorem or certain chemical formulae than he did that, therefore, they know more about the spiritual world. It is doubtful if their wisdom is equal to their self-confidence. Is it not likely that the One who redeems us from sin will know more about the origin and agents of sin than blinded sinners themselves, even though they be "scientists"?

The origin of Satan is a question on which little or no light is thrown in the Bible. There are two things that we can affirm with a fair degree of confidence on general grounds, not specific Scripture teaching. One is that Satan is a created being. We can affirm this for two reasons. One is that the Scriptures teach that God made all things both visible and invisible.[1] The other reason is that in the nature of the case there can be only one eternal and uncreated being. God is the only self-

[1]Col. 1: 16.

existent being. The other thing we feel confident of is that God did not make him a sinful being. God probably made the devil, but did not make him a devil. He doubtless made himself a devil by rebellion against God and then giving himself to the work of enticing others to sin. But as to how and when this took place we have no light. Since the days of Milton, or before, the view has been prevalent that Satan was the chief of the fallen angels. But for this view there is no specific Scripture teaching. It may be true or it may not. Scripture authority can not be claimed for it. The Bible, then, gives us no account of the origin of sin in the universe. It only gives the origin of sin among men. It traces the origin of sin among men to Satanic temptation.

3. How could a sinless being be tempted? There is another question that arises here. It is the question as to how temptation could find anything to appeal to in a being who was sinless. It is often assumed that temptation can appeal only to that which is evil in man, to that which is degraded and corrupted. But this is untrue. The temptation of Eve, as well as the temptation of Christ, makes this clear. Let us examine the temptation of Eve with reference to this point.

In Gen. 3: 6 it is made clear that the forbidden fruit appealed to three desires on Eve's part, every one of which is a normal desire. The first was the physical appetite or the desire for food. Eve saw that the tree was good for food. It looked good to eat. And certainly it is not morally wrong to be hungry or to desire food. To eat is perhaps within itself a morally indifferent act. Ordinarily at least it is not wrong. It was to this perfectly natural and normal desire for food that the devil appealed in tempting Eve and also in tempting Jesus. Then it is said that Eve saw that the tree was a delight to the eyes. It appealed to the sense of the beautiful. And to desire the beautiful is certainly not wrong within itself. Then it is said that she saw that

the tree was to be desired to make one wise. It appealed to the desire for knowledge. This again is a desire that is normally right.

So the devil tempted Eve by appealing to these three desires that are normal in any healthy human being. Wherein, then, consisted her sin? In trying to satisfy these normal desires of her being in the wrong way, contrary to the will of God.

This helps us to understand how temptation makes its appeal to desires of our nature which, if satisfied in the right way, are entirely normal and right. It is a mistaken idea that temptation must appeal to the base and ignoble. It may appeal to that which is highest and best. Sin is the perversion of the good and the worst sin may be the perversion of the best. This helps to correct another false impression with reference to sin. We sometimes think that the higher one goes in the moral and spiritual life the less subject to temptation he will be. This is not true, as every Christian knows who has made any progress in spiritual matters and as the example of the Savior himself shows. It would be nearer the truth to say that the higher one goes in the spiritual life the subtler and fiercer does temptation become. It also helps us to understand how the worst sins are the perversion of the highest and holiest relations in life. Sin always appears in the guise of a good. Otherwise it would be no temptation.

In this way the serpent beguiled Eve and she sinned. She in turn became the temptress and led her husband into sin with her. Adam chose to go with his wife rather than with his God. Paul gives us to understand that he was not deceived as Eve was. He went in with his eyes open.[1]

II. **The nature of sin.** Having considered the origin of sin we turn now to its nature. What is sin? There

[1] 1 Tim. 2: 13, 14.

are three theories with reference to sin which we will examine.

1. Sin as due to bodily appetites and instincts. The first may be summed up in the statement: Sin is due to man's possession of a body. This connects sin with man's physical organism. In its extreme form it is based on the theory that matter is essentially evil. Hence man is a sinner by virtue of his possession of a body. It gains some plausibility from the use of the term flesh in the Bible to denote man as weak and mortal, and, at least in Paul, as sinful. But while the term flesh does denote man as weak and mortal and while Paul uses the term flesh to denote the sphere of the operation of the sin principle and perhaps as synonymous with the sin principle, still the Biblical writers never look upon the body as being evil within itself. This idea came into Christian theology from Greek philosophy. It was reenforced by the doctrine of original sin, especially in the extreme form in which it was held by Augustine. This led to the idea that all things natural were evil. The natural instincts and propensities of the body were evil and should be suppressed. A pious life and a vigorous body could hardly go together. Hence the idea that to cultivate a life of piety one must withdraw from the world and subdue one's body with all its natural desires and propensities.

This view has in recent times taken on a somewhat modified form due to the theory of evolution. This theory has led to the tendency to regard sin as the remains of animal instinct in man. Sin, therefore, is not so much a thing that is culpable as it is certain animal tendencies that must be curbed and brought under the control of man's rational will. There was no fall of man according to this theory. The account in Genesis is a legendary account of the awakening of the moral consciousness of man.

Neither form of this theory is a sufficient account of sin. The body is never regarded as evil in the Scriptures. Paul does not mean by the term flesh, when used as a synonym for the sin principle, the body. He does not regard the body as sinful in itself. He speaks about the mind or thoughts of the flesh.[1] And he includes envy, strife, jealousy, etc., as works of the flesh, which shows that the flesh was a spiritual and not simply a bodily principle.[2]

Sin can not be regarded simply as the remains of animal instinct in man. It is true that much of man's sin is connected with his bodily organism and physical desires and instincts, but much of the most diabolical factor in sin is not connected primarily with the animal appetites or instincts of man. Such sins as pride and ambition can hardly be regarded as the remains of animal instincts.

2. Sin as weakness and limitation. Another theory as to the nature of sin can be summed up in the statement: Sin is limitation due to man's finiteness. It is not deliberate and wilful transgression. It is weakness and error. This theory goes back in different forms at least as far as Socrates. He said that no man would deliberately do that which he knew would harm himself. Sin, therefore, is not wilful. Man does wrong because he does not know better. Theodore Parker is a good representative of this view among early New England Unitarians. He said that sin bore the same relation to man's developing spiritual life that falling does to a child's learning to walk. The child can not learn to walk without falling. But by falling the child learns to walk. So by his moral blundering man learns the lessons necessary to the development of his moral and spiritual life.

This view takes the element of wilfulness out of sin

[1]Rom. 8: 6, 7 [2]Gal. 5: 19-21.

and the element of guilt. And that element is there as conscience testifies, particularly an enlightened Christian conscience, as well as Scripture. Socrates and Paul held opposite philosophies with reference to the matter. Socrates said in substance: "What man needs is enlightenment. Show him what to do and he will do it. What man needs is knowledge as to what is right and what is wrong. When he knows the right he will do it." Paul said in effect: "When a man knows what is right he will not do it because he cannot. He does not have the moral ability. There is in him a principle of sin that is too strong for him. What man needs is not simply a knowledge of what is right but some motive power to enable him to do the right. Without this power he is helpless."[1] Parker's view that man learns to do right by doing wrong will not bear the test of experience. Experience shows that about all man learns by sinning is to sin.

3. Sin as rebellion against God. Suppose we take for a tentative definition of sin the statement that sin is rebellion against the will of God. To make clear the nature of sin as rebellion against God the following points need emphasis:

(1) The element of wilfulness in sin. As already stated one factor in man's personality, one thing that marks him as a being created in the divine image, is the power of will. To be capable of obedience or disobedience man must have the power of freedom of choice. The obedience of physical elements or of animals to the law of their being deserves no praise because these have no choice. With them it is a matter of physical necessity or animal instinct. Their conformity to the law of their being is obedience only in a secondary sense. Man obeys because he wills to obey.

As free to obey or disobey, God addresses his commands to man. Why was man singled out at the begin-

[1]See especially Rom. 7.

ning as the one being whom God had created to whom God should address a specific command, unless it be that man by virtue of his personality has the power of free obedience or disobedience? This principle as a presupposition underlies all God's dealings with man as recorded in the Bible. Man is more than mechanism. He is a person. Even God, his Creator, respects his personality.

This comes out even more clearly in the fact that God not only commands man, but also entreats, persuades, exhorts him. God's respect for man's will comes out in the fact that God uses men as his messengers to persuade their fellows to obey God. One of the most impressive things about the Biblical revelation of God is the infinite patience of God in dealing with erring and sinful man. God was never without his witnesses and messengers. Particularly from the time of Moses on, after God had entered into covenant relations with Israel as a nation, the record is one long story of the backsliding and unfaithfulness of Israel and of the faithfulness and long-suffering of Jehovah. This comes out through the whole of Old Testament history and is the theme of such Psalms as the 78th.

This is impressively brought out in the life and teaching of Jesus. Jesus weeps over Jerusalem as he sees the impending doom of the city. He gives as the reason for its coming desolation that its inhabitants would not be gathered to him.[1] But this comes out nowhere more clearly than in Paul's great saying in 2 Cor. 5: 19, 20. He says God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. Then he adds: "We are ambassadors, therefore, on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." It is not a surprising thing that God the Creator should command man his creature. But it is surprising that God should entreat man. It shows dis-

[1]Luke 13: 34.

tinctly the respect that God has for man's will and the element of wilfulness in man's rebellion against God.

(2) Sin as wilful implies knowledge. If man's sin is wilful, then it must be sin against light. When there is no knowledge of moral truth, there can be no sin in the full sense of the term. Perhaps this is implied in Paul's statement that where there is no law, neither is there transgression.[1] He also says that through the law is the knowledge of sin.[2] In Rom. 7 Paul describes a state in which he says that at one time he was alive without the law. But when the commandment came "sin revived and I died." When he came to know a certain thing as forbidden of the law, he did not thereby refrain from doing that thing, but rather came to do it. This shows that there was an intimate connection between a knowledge of the will of God and sin as an active principle in human life.[3]

But knowledge of moral and spiritual things, particularly knowledge of God and his will, presupposes revelation on God's part. As a matter of fact, we find the idea of sin in the Bible intimately related to two other ideas—revelation on God's part and a knowledge of that revelation on man's part. In general there are four stages in this revelation, each connected with the idea of sin in the New Testament. The first is the revelation of God in nature or the physical world. This Paul discusses in Rom. 1: 18ff. The invisible things of God are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity. Paul says that this knowledge of God coming through nature leaves men without excuse. Although men knew God as thus revealed, they would not honor him in their lives. They rejected him, refusing to honor and serve him. As a consequence they became blinded. They were plunged into idolatry and all sorts of moral and spiritual degradation. In Acts 14: 17 Paul speaks also

[1]Rom. 4: 15. [2]Rom. 3: 20. [3]See vs. 7-11.

of the works of nature as being a witness of God. We find this thought in the Old Testament in Ps. 19 and other places.

The next stage in the revelation of God as related to sin is his revelation in reason and conscience, or man's rational and moral nature. Paul says that the Gentiles, who have not the law, "are a law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them."[1] The heart here is probably a general term denoting about what we denote by moral nature. It seems that Paul is setting forth that the requirements of the law, at least in a general way, are revealed in man's moral consciousness and that obedience to these requirements of the law as thus made known is virtually obedience to the law. The knowledge of the distinction between right and wrong, with the consciousness that we are bound to do the right and avoid the wrong, with some knowledge as to what is right and what is wrong —this is at least a partial revelation of the moral requirements of the law and thus of the moral nature of God. To live up to the light thus given is so far to keep the law. Not to live up to the light thus given is to violate the law and thus to sin.

A third stage in God's revelation may be denoted by the term law. This is Paul's great term when thinking of God's revelation of himself in relation to man as sinful. By this he means primarily the Old Testament or Mosaic law. Sometimes he uses the term without the article, sometimes with it. With the article it is clear that he means the Mosaic law. And without the article he also means primarily the Mosaic law, but he is thinking of that law as embodying universal principles of righteousness or moral requirement. When he uses the article he is thinking of the Mosaic law more as

[1]Rom. 2: 14, 15.

a concrete system of particular requirements. Without the article the Mosaic law is still in mind but rather as made up of universal principles of general application.[1]

The law is the embodiment of the moral requirements of God in published ordinances. The center of the Old Testament law looked at as moral requirement is the ten commandments. The requirement of the law is perfect obedience to its mandates. The law as such allows of no exceptions and makes no provision for any remission of penalty. It condemns without mercy every violator of its precepts. We mean by this the law as moral requirement, which seems to be the chief, if not the exclusive, point of view of Paul when discussing the law in relation to sin. There was, it is true, provision for ceremonial cleansing and forgiveness in the law. But Paul does not seem to include this aspect of the law in his use of the term; at least ordinarily he does not, if ever.

Sin as against the command or moral requirement of the law Paul calls a trespass or transgression.[2]

The function of the law in relation to sin was not to justify or save from sin, but rather to awaken one to a consciousness of sin, to one's helplessness in sin, to one's need of the Redeemer and thus serve as the pedagogue to lead the sinner to Christ.[3]

The climax of revelation in relation to sin came in the revelation of the grace of God in Christ which saves from sin. The point we are interested in here is not the light we get in this revelation concerning grace, but the light which grace throws upon sin. We might get the impression from some statements in Paul that the full doctrine of sin came in connection with the revelation of the law. It is true that Paul emphasizes the function of the law as a means of developing the nature of sin and giving a knowledge of sin. But we do not get the

[1]Cf. Stevens, "Pauline Theology," p. 160.

[2]See Rom. 5: 12ff and other places.

[3]See Rom. 7 and Gal. 3.

complete doctrine of sin until we see the grace of God that saves from sin. The awful blackness of sin does not make its full impression on us until we see it in contrast to the radiant grace of God. This may be illustrated in the case of Paul himself, who seems to have had a deepening consciousness of sin until in his old age he calls himself the chief of sinners.[1] His own conduct in persecuting the church he thought to be right until he was given the revelation of God's grace. Then he became a guilty sinner in his own eyes. This thought is also illustrated in the teaching of Jesus. Jesus says that because of his presence and teaching in their midst the cities of his day will receive a greater condemnation than Sodom and Gomorrah.[2] The servant who has the knowledge of the master's will and does it not will be beaten with many stripes, while the servant who knew not the master's will will be beaten with few.[3] Again, Jesus says that, if he had not come, those who reject him had not had sin. Now they have no excuse for their sin.[4] Men are condemned because they love darkness rather than light. The condemnation is that light is come into the world and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.[5] The light of God's grace does two things for the sinful heart: it reveals its darkness and it increases that darkness in case of those who reject the light of grace.

It is in the Johannine writings that this contrast between sin and grace is brought out most clearly. Sin is set forth as darkness and hatred and error, while grace is light and love and truth. Between the two there has been a never-ceasing conflict and there will be in the future until grace finally conquers sin. The conflict of the future is most graphically set forth in the book of Revelation, and there you have the most vivid portrayal of the forces of evil in conflict with the forces of righteousness to be found anywhere in literature. In

[1] 1 Tim. 1: 15. [2] Matt. 11: 20ff. [3] Luke 12: 47, 48. [4] John 15: 22. [5] John 3: 19.

the Gospel and First Epistle we find the contrast between the darkness of sin and the light of righteousness strikingly presented. And sin takes its final form in unbelief or rejection of Christ as the Son of God and Savior of the world. He that believeth not is condemned already because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God.[1] He that disobeyeth the Son shall not see life but the wrath of God abideth on him.[2] When the Holy Spirit is come, he will convict the world in respect of sin, of righteousness and of judgment.[3] This last passage is worthy of special emphasis in this connection and we will dwell on it for a time.

The Holy Spirit's work in convicting concerning righteousness is intimately related to his work in convicting concerning sin. In fact, these are not two works but simply two phases of one convicting work. This bears out our position that the final revelation as to sin does not come until we get to the grace of God in Christ. The revelation of righteousness in Christ reveals the nature of sin. The conviction both as to righteousness and sin centers in Christ.

The conviction as to judgment consists in the fact that the prince of this world has been judged. The devil's judgment of Jesus becomes his own judgment. The world's condemnation of Jesus became the world's condemnation. The final revelation of the diabolical character of sin came in the rejection by the world of the sinless Son of God. In thus denuding sin of all its embellishments and attractions and showing it up in its true character, sin was condemned in the eyes of every enlightened moral intelligence. This again shows that the final revelation of the character of sin came in connection with the revelation of the grace of God. Sin crucified the Son of God. But in so doing sin forever undid itself in that it forever disclosed its own character as sin.

[1]John 3: 18. [2]John 3: 36. [3]John 16: 8ff.

The conviction as to sin lies in the fact that men believe not on Christ. This probably means, not that unbelief in Christ is evidence of the world's sin, but that the world's sin consists in its unbelief in him. This position is justified not only by this passage, but also by the statements elsewhere in the Johannine writings as to unbelief. It is everywhere identified with moral darkness. In the First Epistle the liar is the man who denies that Jesus is the Christ.[1] Perhaps the sin unto death is the final and obdurate rejection of Jesus as the Son of God.[2]

(3) What has just been said would favor the view that unbelief is the essence of sin. This does not mean, however, unbelief in the sense of a refusal to accept a doctrine or a dogma. It is unbelief in one's rejection of moral and spiritual light, particularly as that light is embodied in Jesus Christ. It is the rejection of God's final revelation of himself as made in Jesus Christ. When this rejection becomes definite and wilful, it becomes the sin unto death.[3] It is then a wilful treading under foot of the Son of God, counting the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and doing despite to the Spirit of grace.[4] It thus becomes moral suicide. It is putting out one's own spiritual eyes. It does not take place except in connection with a high degree of enlightenment. It is deliberate, wilful, malicious rejection of Christ as God's revelation, knowing that he is such a revelation. It is deliberately calling white black.

At first sight this does not seem to agree with what Jesus says about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, because he says that all sins and blasphemies shall be forgiven, but not the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.[5] But if we remember that the sin that men were committing which led Jesus to utter this warning was the

[1] 1 John 2: 22.
[2] 1 John 5: 13-17.
[3] As above.
[4] Heb. 10: 29.
[5] Matt. 12: 22ff.

sin of attributing his works to the power of the devil, thus denying that they were wrought by the power of God, then he is not thinking of sin or blasphemy against the Spirit irrespective of the Spirit's relation to the Father or the Son. He is probably thinking of the Spirit as embodied in his own life and works and thus revealing the presence of God, giving men light to see and recognize God in his own life and works. When men thus enlightened by the Spirit deliberately reject his works as the works of God and attribute them to the devil, they blaspheme the Spirit and there is never forgiveness for their sin. This is essentially unbelief in its final form as set forth by John and wilful sin as described in Hebrews.

Some have defined the essential principle of sin as selfishness, not selfishness as opposed to benevolence toword one's fellowman, but selfishness in the sense of the assertion of one's own will as opposed to submission to the will of God. To live in sin, then, is to live a life centered in self, to erect one's own will as the law of life. This, it is said, is shown to be the essential principle of sin in the fact that love to God is the essence of virtue. Therefore, the opposite must be the essence of sin. Again, the fact that Jesus made the first condition of discipleship to be self-denial would indicate that selfishness is the essential principle of sin. But, as a matter of fact, selfishness as thus defined is practically the same thing as unbelief as set forth above. Each is the principle of self-assertion as opposed to humble submission and trust in God. Each is rebellion against God. Each is practically the same thing that John had in mind when he said that sin is lawlessness. And violation of the moral order established by God is rebellion against God.

(4) Consider another phase of the doctrine of sin. Sometimes sin is contemplated as a violation of the moral order or law, sometimes it is considered as a

personal offence to God. It seems to be more in the former sense that Paul views it. He conceives of nature, man's heart and conscience, and the whole Old Testament revelation as an expression of the righteous will of God in an objective moral order. Sin is a violation of this moral order and brings upon man the wrath of God. It is not necessary that there should be a written law whose commands man shall violate in order to bring upon himself the wrath of a righteous God. He may sin against God who reveals himself in nature and man's own moral constitution. And when he does so, he brings on himself the condemnation of a holy God.

In other places sin is thought of as a personal offence to God. This comes out as distinctly in the fifty-first psalm as anywhere else when the writer, looking at the enormity of his sin, says: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned and done that which is evil in thy sight."[1] The writer does not mean that he has not sinned against his fellowman, but means to assert in emphatic form that his sin is first of all against God.

But these two aspects of sin are not opposed to each other. They are supplementary. The moral order, which Paul contemplates as being violated by sin, is an expression of the righteous will of God. The evil consequences that come upon man as the natural result of his sin are looked upon as being the judicial visitation of God upon his sin. Law is not one thing and God's will another. The moral law is the expression of the righteous will of God. The moral law is grounded in the nature of God as holy. Both aspects of sin should be kept in mind if we would understand sin. It may be viewed as a violation of the moral order, or it may be looked upon as a personal offence to God. In either case it is sin against God.

(5) Viewing sin as personal ill desert, we describe it by the term guilt. There is probably no single term in

[1] Vs. 4.

the Old or New Testament denoting just this idea, yet the thought goes all the way through both divisons of the Bible. The sense of shame and ill desert leads Adam to clothe himself with fig leaves and hide himself from his Maker.[1] Adam tried to shift the blame to his wife and Eve to the serpent; but in each case there was clearly the sense of ill desert.

The guilt of sin manifests itself in consciousness. Man knows himself as blameworthy on account of his sin. This conscousness of ill desert is a general phenomenon of human life, especially of man's religious life. This is true in spite of the fact that there is a general disposition to hide one's sense of ill desert and cover up or deny one's responsibility for sin. In fact, the attempt to cover up one's guilt is itself an evidence of guilt. A clear conscience is not so quick to attempt to justify itself as a guilty one. This sense of guilt manifests itself also in the fact that men blame one another with reference to their deeds.

This consciousness of ill desert, however, is not to be taken as the accurate measure of the guilt of sin. This is true with reference to one's own sin or another's. Our moral judgments are no more infallible than our judgments in other realms. In fact, it is often the case that the reverse is true, namely, that the greater one's guilt, the less is he conscious of it. This is true because of the blinding power of sin. Sin darkens the spiritual vision and warps the moral judgment. Consequently, probably the most dangerous condition that one can be in spiritually is to have no consciousness of sin and no sense of danger. For one to have no sense of ill desert is not a sign that one is without guilt; it is a sign that he is spiritually blind and in great spiritual danger. The closer one gets to God, the more conscious he is of his own unworthiness. On the other hand, if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is

[1]Gen. 3: 8.

not in us.[1] Self-conscious goodness is always sham goodness. It is rotten at the core. This was one of the outstanding characteristics of the Pharisees. They thanked God that they were not like other men. They turned up their noses at "publicans and sinners." They despised Jesus for associating with such human driftwood. But these self-righteous Pharisees were the men that Jesus denounced most bitterly. He scorched them with the fires of his righteous indignation. On the other hand is Paul who in his old age called himself the chief of sinners,[2] and counted not that he had attained perfection.[3]

The ground of guilt, however, is the relation of man as ill deserving to the holiness of God. Man's sin is ill deserving because it is against God as holy. If God were not holy, sin would not be ill deserving. Sin is a religious concept. It is primarily sin against God. The conception of any religion as to the character of sin is determined primarily by its conception of the character of God. It is against the background of God's spotless character that the blackness of sin is to be seen. This is why the saintly man sees his own sin so clearly, because he sees his sin over against the character of God. This comes out clearly in the sixth chapter of Isaiah. The prophet sees Jehovah high and lifted up, the exalted and holy One. Then he sees himself and the people among whom he lives as sinful. The perfection of God's character is probably the fundamental conception of the First Epistle of John. God is light and love. In contrast to the perfection of his character the writer sees with distinctness man's sin. If any man says that he has no sin, he deceives himself and the truth is not in him.

Men are not equally guilty before God. In the Old Testament there were sins of ignorance and sins of presumption; sins that could be atoned for by sacrifices and

[1]1 John 1: 8 [2]1 Tim. 1: 15. [3]Phil. 3: 12, 13.

sins that put one outside the covenant relation to God. Jesus recognizes this principle. The people of Sodom and Gomorrah will not have as heavy condemnation as the cities which had the benefit of his ministry and teaching.[1] The servant who knows not his master's will shall not have the same punishment as the one who knows but does not.[2] Paul also recognizes the same principle. Men are held responsible for the light they have, whether that light be the light of nature, of the heart and conscience or of the Old Testament law.[3]

It seems, then, that light and privilege are elements that enter into the determination of the degree of one's guilt. The degree of one's guilt might be said to be determined by the measure of wilfulness that enters into one's sinning.[4] To the extent that one sins wilfully, to that extent is one guilty and his character fixed in sin.

It is sometimes said that ignorance is no excuse, and the implication is that the ignorant are as guilty as those who have greater light and privilege. But this will not hold. The case of Paul is sometimes cited to show that one may act ignorantly and yet be guilty. Paul does seem to imply here that he was conscientious and yet guilty. But Paul also says that because he did what he did ignorantly in unbelief, God had mercy on him. This clearly implies that his ignorance modified his guilt.[5]

This principle is recognized in the social relations of life. The man with light, privilege, opportunity, ability, is held to a stricter account by his fellowmen. Courts of law take into account the element of deliberateness in a man's crime in assessing his penalty.

(6) Another phase of sin is described by the term depravity. a. By this term is meant that state or condition of man's moral nature that makes it not only possible that he may sin on account of his power of choice, but certain that he will sin on account of his moral weakness and inherent tendency toward evil. This depravity

[1]Matt. 11: 20ff. [2]Luke 12: 47, 48. [3]Rom. 1 and 2. [4]Heb. 10: 26ff. [5]1 Tim. 1: 13.

of man's nature is inherent and universal. These two ideas—the idea that depravity is inherent and that it is universal—seem to be inseparable. Certainly, if sin is inherent, it is universal; and, on the other hand, if it is universal, there is a strong presumption that it is inherent. By saying that sin or depravity is inherent we do not mean that sin is a constituent element in human nature, or that sin and human nature are inseparable. Human nature was not created sinful or depraved. Christ did not have a depraved human nature. Besides, if sin were a constituent element in human nature, man could not be saved from sin. But in saying that depravity is inherent in human nature is meant that man as fallen is born depraved; that since Adam's time and on account of Adam's sin, all men are born with such a moral tendency toward sin that it is a moral certainty, that it is morally inevitable, that when they come to make moral choices, they will commit sin.

b. That sin is inherent is evidenced by the following facts: (a) The direct teaching of Scripture. In Psalm 51 the writer says: "In sin did my mother conceive me."[1] Jeremiah says: "The heart is deceitful and desperately wicked; who can know it?"[2] Paul says that we are by nature the children of wrath.[3] Some claim that Paul is not here referring to the inborn disposition inasmuch as in the context he is discussing the course of life as sinful. Hence it is said that he is not talking about that which is born in us, but a course of actual sin or transgression. As a matter of fact, he is talking about a course of life, but it is a course of life as growing out of and as expressing the inborn disposition. It is the native disposition developing in its natural course into a life of sin. The life of sin is explained by referring it to the native moral disposition. Men are by nature the children of wrath in the sense that their lives of sin,

[1]Ps. 51: 5. [2]Jer. 17: 9. [3]Eph. 2: 3.

which incur the wrath of God, are the natural outgrowth of their native disposition.

(b) Another fact that shows that depravity is inherent in the sense indicated above, is the fact that it is universal. That sin is universal is clearly taught in the Bible. In Genesis following the sin of the first man there is the intensive and extensive development of sin until the race soon became so corrupt that God sent a flood and destroyed the race except Noah and his family. While Noah was a man of faith he was a very imperfect man. It is made clear that no man in Biblical history was sinless, except Jesus himself. The very best men of both Old and New Testament times were very weak and sinful. The psalmist represents God as searching the earth, but finding none without sin.[1] Jesus regarded all men as sinful. He says: "If ye, then, being evil."[2] This expression shows that he regards all men as evil and sinful. He teaches, as one of the fundamental things in prayer, that men should pray for forgiveness.[3] They need forgiveness as universally as they need daily bread. Paul explicitly teaches that all men are sinners. All have sinned.[4] This presupposition underlies his argument in Romans 5: 12ff.

Experience, observation, and human history show that sin is universal. The best of men confess themselves sinners. Nor is this to be interpreted as the result of an abnormal or morbid consciousness on their part. Men who, like Paul, Luther and John Bunyan, stand at the center of spiritual Christianity cannot be regarded as wholly misinterpreting their own relation to God. Then the consensus of opinion among men is that no man lives above moral and spiritual blame. The course of human history indicates that there is something fundamentally wrong with mankind.

The best explanation of the universality of sin is to explain it by referring it to the corruption of human na-

[1]Ps. 14: 1ff.
[2]Luke 11: 13.
[3]Matt. 6: 12.
[4]Rom. 3: 9ff.

ture in the beginning of human history. The Bible gives us to understand that the first man violated God's expressed will and by doing so the stream of human history was corrupted at its source.

c. The question has been much discussed as to whether man is totally depraved. That depends altogether on the definition of total depravity. If by total depravity is meant that man is as corrupt as he can be, then certainly the doctrine is not true. But in the sense that man is totally helpless, because of his natural inheritance, outside the provisions of God's saving grace, the doctrine is true. The matter might be summed up by saying man is totally depraved in the following sense:

(a) In the sense that man's whole nature, every element and faculty of his being, has been weakened and depraved by sin. Body, soul and spirit have passed under its power. Man's mind has been darkened, his heart depraved, his will perverted by sin.

(b) It means that man is totally unable to deliver himself from the power of sin. Here is the crux of the matter. The truth for which the term total depravity stands is the total inability of man to save himself, his entire helplessness in the grasp of sin.

(c) Without divine help man becomes worse and worse. Instead of total depravity meaning that man is as bad as he can be, it means that without the redeeming power of God's grace, he will forever sink deeper and deeper into sin.

Much of the dispute over the term total depravity has been aside from the mark, because it was based on the preconception that the thing that made sin deadly was the extent to which man was affected by it. Sin was regarded as ruinous provided the sin was big enough. But it is not the extent of sin that makes it deadly: it is the nature of sin. Sin kills because it is sin, not because it is big. The very nature of sin is such that it would dethrone God and introduce moral and spiritual

anarchy into God's universe. It is in direct antithesis to God's nature as holy. Therefore, no sin can be tolerated in man. The very nature of sin is such that it poisons man's moral nature and ruins his spiritual life. It cuts man off from God. It enslaves.

Jesus and Paul emphasize the servitude of sin. Jesus says that the man who commits sin is the servant of sin.[1] In one place he says that the truth will free from this bondage; in another, the Son.[2] Paul sets forth in Rom. 6 that man is either the servant of sin or of God and righteousness. In chapter 7 he gives a vivid account of his own struggle with the power of sin, his utter inability to deliver himself and his finding deliverance in Christ. There seem to be three distinct stages in Paul's experience as set forth in this chapter. The first is a state which he speaks of as being alive without the law.[3] He had no consciousness of condemnation and death, because he had not been awakened by the law to a knowledge of its demands. The second stage is one in which he becomes aware of the righteous demands of the law, but cannot live up to its demands. "The commandment came, sin revived, and I died."[4] This leads to a sense of utter helplessness and then of despair. Finally comes the realization of deliverance through Christ.[5] This reigning principle of sin Paul recognizes as being universal, as shown in chapter 5.

III. **Original sin.**

1. A preliminary survey. The question of original sin is another about which there has been much debate. The facts to be accounted for are in general two: man's inborn moral depravity and, secondly, the universality of sin. These are the facts of vital moment to man. These facts do not depend upon any particular explanation as to how they came to be. They are not two facts, but two aspects of one dark and

[1]John 8: 34. [3]Vs. 9a. [5]Vs. 25.
[2]John 8: 32, 36. [4]Vs. 9b.

awful fact—the reign of sin in human life and history. Paul in Rom. 5 connects the universal reign of sin and death with the transgression of Adam. Many theories have been invented as to how we are related to Adam's sin in such a way as that his sin became the means or ground of our condemnation and death. Paul himself offers no theory of the matter. He simply asserts the fact. The most simple and natural explanation is that, since Adam was the natural head and source of the race, the race as a whole inherits a depraved nature from him. In other words, the fact of sin and death as a universal phenomenon in human life is traced back to Adam's sin as the cause or source. The connection between Adam and his descendants is simply that of head of the race and members who spring from him. As to the imputation of Adam's sin as an act of sin to the individual members of the race, no theory of such imputation is needed, for the simple reason that there was no such imputation. The idea that Adam's sin as an act of sin is charged to his descendants and on that account they are guilty and hence condemned is an idea too preposterous to be seriously entertained.

2. The Augustinian and federal theories. The Augustinian theory is that because men were seminally present in Adam, or present as to the substance of their being, they, therefore, shared in his sin, and on that ground the sin was charged to them. They are, therefore, guilty of Adam's sin, because they shared in it. Since the sin is imputed to them and they are guilty of it, they are born depraved and condemned. To say the least of it, this theory regards in a very crude and materialistic way the idea of Adam's descendants being present in him. There is no sense in which Adam's descendants can be regarded as having been present in him so as to justify the imputation of Adam's sin to them.

The federal theory is no better. It says that God made a covenant with Adam, the terms of which were

that on condition of Adam's obedience to God his descendants should have eternal life; on condition of his disobedience his sin should be charged to them, and hence they would be guilty and condemned.

There is not a shred of evidence from the Bible that any such covenant was ever made with Adam. Somebody has well said that the covenant originated in Holland rather than in the garden of Eden. Such a charging of the sins of one human individual to another on the ground of a covenant, with which the one to whom sin is charged had nothing to do, would be the height of injustice.

3. Race unity. There is, however, an organic unity of the race which inevitably results in the members suffering with and for each other. God created the race as a race, not as detached and isolated units. Because of this organic unity of the race the whole race fell in Adam's sin. If one objects to this on the ground that one member should not suffer for another's wrongdoing, the answer is that this is a law of life, no matter what we may say about it. It is not a question as to whether we think it should have been that way or not. As a matter of fact, it is that way. And it must be that way, if there is is to be any social life for man. An arrangement according to which every man would suffer only for his own wrongdoing would be an arrangement in which every man stood out as an isolated, detached unit. There would be no social life in such an arrangement. Nor could there be any such thing as one man enjoying the benefits of another's labor or goodness. Not only would there be no social evil; there could be no social good. Every man must suffer with inexorable, mathematical precision the exact desert of his own deeds and nobody could help him.

The best social thought of our times emphasizes this aspect of both sin and righteousness; namely, that others are affected by either. No man can draw him-

self off into a corner and live to himself in such a way that nobody else is concerned as to the kind of life that he lives. Others are concerned, vitally concerned. While sin, as before stated, is primarily against God, this truth has sometimes been interpreted in such a one-sided way as to make the impression that only God and the individual soul are concerned in one's sin. But sin is a social affair. There is no such thing as an individual in the sense of a detached and unrelated unit. No sin in its consequences is ever limited to the soul that commits it. Sin is against God. But God has established a social and moral order. This order in which men live together is violated by man's sin.

The doctrine of original sin means that man is not only a social being, but that the race is an organic unity, and as an organic unity it was affected by the sin of the first man, the head of the race. Through the law of natural generation, the whole race has inherited the evil effects of that first transgression. All men have been born on a lower moral and spiritual plane than they would have been if Adam had not sinned.

4. Individual responsibility in relation to race unity. (1) Most of the difficulty on this question has grown out of the effort to solve the theoretical question as to whether the individual was guilty on account of that first sin and to what extent and on what ground. So far as individual responsibility and guilt are concerned, there can be no such responsibility and guilt for an act committed thousands of years before one was born and with which he had nothing to do. I am no more individually responsible, and hence guilty, for what Adam did than I am for what Julius Caesar did. But I am affected in my life by what both did. Organic, social and historical influences have bound my life up with what they did. As to the justice of an order of things in which that should be true, I may not be able to work that out. There are theoretical difficulties. It may be

difficult to understand how I should be responsible for deeds which grow out of and express a nature which I inherited. If I am not responsible for the nature, how can I be responsible for the deeds which inevitably grow out of it?

(2) In answer to this difficulty some things may be said:

a. The first is that whatever theory one may hold as to Adam's sin and our relation to it, the fact seems to stand that when we come to the age of moral consciousness and moral activity, we find ourselves so identified with evil impulses within us and evil social forces around us that we are already practical slaves to them. These evil forces did not originate in acts of our own will. This may seem like a fact of dark and ominous aspect, but we cannot get rid of it by denying its existence. Unpleasant facts are not disposed of by denying their right to be or by calling them by euphemistic names. Men have tried long enough to heal the world's moral corruption by this kind of word jugglery.

b. The second fact to be observed is that both Scripture and moral consciousness bear testimony to our responsibility for our lives in spite of our inherited natures. In fact, this evil inheritance is regarded in Scripture as constituting a part of our awful condition, calling for divine grace and help. The testimony of our moral consciousness on this point cannot be doubted. As evil and sinful, we acknowledge our deplorable state and renounce the sinful self. One must deny this sinful self, take up one's cross, be crucified with Christ, in order to live.

c. Another thing is that our race heredity and evil social environment doubtless modify our responsibility and guilt. There are principles in Scripture and human consciousness which would justify this conclusion.

d. In the fourth place, there is general agreement among all classes of evangelical theologians, justified by

principles drawn from the New Testament and our Christian consciousness, that all disability up to the point of positive transgression and deliberate rejection of moral light is provided for in the atoning work of Christ. There is race redemption as well as race sin. No man, therefore, will be lost merely because of original or race sin. Up to the point of positive transgression or rejection of moral light the individual is provided for in the grace of God without personal repentance and faith. Someone may be unsatisfied at this point on the ground that it leaves a borderland in which we cannot tell as to the condition and destiny of the individual. That is true. It does leave a borderland. But it makes reasonably clear the principles upon which God deals with men. As to deciding the destiny of the individual, we need not give ourselves any undue concern about that, since it is not our business. It is made plain in the New Testament that the man who rejects clear gospel light is lost. The man who definitely accepts the grace of God is saved. As to those who fall in between, we can very safely leave them in the hands of God. Since that is where their destiny finally rests, that is what we will likely do, whether we will or no. The only relation we have to the matter is to carry the light of the gospel to all men, so that their responsibility in the matter will be as definite as possible. As for deciding matters which rest in the hands of God, he can probably do that better than we can. The best way for us to clear ourselves in the matter is to do what he has clearly revealed as his will. As to deciding who is lost and who is not, even if we cannot decide in the case of each individual, it is clear as to the difference in standing before God of those who reject clear gospel light and those who accept it. As has been well said, although we cannot thrust in a knife blade at the exact point that separates day and night and say that here one ends and the other begins, still

the difference between light and darkness is tolerably clear.

5. Conclusion as to the moral condition and salvation of the infant. As to the question of infant salvation, then, it is generally agreed among evangelical theologians that those dying in infancy are saved. This is not held so much on the ground that there is specific Scripture teaching to that effect as it is because of certain general principles in gospel teaching as to God's dealings with men, and because of the general view of the character of God as revealed in Christ. There are several positions on this question of the condition and destiny of the child that may be summed up in brief statements.

One position may be put in the statement that the child is an angel. But the child is not an angel, using that term to symbolize an innocent, unfallen being. The child is depraved in nature and potentially a transgressor of God's law.

Another position may be summed up in the statement that the child is a devil. But that is not true. The idea of a devil or demon is a being wholly determined toward evil, and so without impulses to good that even the grace of God could not change its character.

Another statement that summarizes the position of many is that the child is an animal. The child is an animal, but much more. If the child were only an animal, it would never become capable of moral life and character. The child has the capacity of developing into a moral personality. It does not have the powers and capacities of personality at first, but normally these develop. In that sense the child transcends the animal. It does not have the developed powers of personality, but its normal destiny is to grow into personality. In that sense it is personal.

Moreover, there are such seeds of evil tendency in the child's nature, and such social influences for evil in the world in which the child lives that it inevitably

commits transgressions when it comes to the age of moral responsibility. In that sense the child is a sinner. It does not have personal guilt. That is impossible where the conditions of personal responsibility are lacking. These are absent in the child's life until the powers of self-consciousness and self-determination arise. There can be no personal guilt except in the case of a personal agent.

In view of these considerations we believe that we are justified in holding that the child dying in infancy is saved. In other words, where there has been conscious and positive identification of one's self with evil, there must be also, under the grace of God, conscious and positive repudiation of evil and identification of one's self with right, before there can be deliverance from evil. Up to the point of positive identification of one's self with right or wrong, there is only the potentiality of moral life. In the case of the child, that potentiality is evil except for the positive influence of the grace of God in redeeming from this evil potentiality or the life of transgression that grows out of it. So far as the bent of the child's nature and the social influences of the world order are concerned, these are toward evil. To save the child from this evil inheritance requires the grace of God which transcends nature and the world order.

If anyone should raise the objection that this makes gospel light a dangerous thing, in that it may be the means of heavier condemnation, we not only grant the objection, but urge that it is true. But all moral light is dangerous. The most benevolent forces in the world when properly used become the most dangerous when we are ill-adjusted to them. The life-giving forces of air, water and light become life-destroying unless wisely controlled and directed. Intelligence wrongly directed becomes darkness and death. The grace of God when rejected becomes eternal death and irretrievable destruc-

tion. To be a person with its moral opportunities and responsibilities is itself a dangerous thing. But who would, therefore, care to sink to the level of the brute? Consequently, the forces that make for the development of personality are hazardous forces. The highest of these is the grace of God that saves from sin. But so far as we can see, even God cannot make and develop personality without running the risk involved. He cannot present his grace to man with a view to his salvation without running the risk of having men reject that grace and thereby incur condemnation.

IV. **The penalty of sin.**

1. The certainty and nature of penalty. There is nothing more clearly taught in the Scriptures than that God punishes sin. Adam was warned that punishment would follow disobedience. This is one of the outstanding lessons of Old Testament history. Such examples as the Flood, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the inflictions on the Egyptians in connection with the deliverance of the Israelites, the history of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, the Babylonian captivity—these with many other events too numerous to mention, in the history of the people as a whole and in the lives of individuals, emphasize this great truth.

God's punishment for sin was one of the fundamental principles of the Mosaic law. This law was founded on the character of God as supreme and as holy. The supremacy and holiness of God pledged him to punish sin. The Old Testament prophets were nearly always persecuted by the people because they denounced the sins of the people and told of the coming judgment of God on the people for their sins.

Punishment for sin is as clearly set forth in the New Testament as in the Old. Nobody taught more clearly or forcefully the certainty that punishment follows sin than did Jesus. He has more to say about hell than

anybody else in the New Testament. His teaching was: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."[1] Paul announced that God commands all men everywhere to repent because he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world.[2]

The grace of God in saving from sin does not do away with punishment for sin. This is shown in two things. One is that God does not save by excusing man in sin or simply letting him off from the penalty of sin. He saves on the ground that his sin has been atoned for. The cross of Christ is the revelation of God's judgment upon the sin of the world. He saved us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us.[3] The other thing is that grace rejected means eternal ruin. We do not find the doctrine of hell in connection with the law of the Old Testament, but in connection with the revelation of the grace of God in Christ.

God's holy character would be forever compromised if he did not punish sin. As certainly as God is holy will sin be punished, and because he is holy. Human experience and history teach this lesson as well as Scripture. As certainly as man sins he suffers loss.

Penalty includes any loss that comes to man on account of his sin. Penalty may come in connection with man's relation to nature and through the laws of nature, it may come in the form of the deterioration of his own powers, in the loss of fellowship with God or as eternal death in the next world.

2. Natural evil and penalty. One question that arises here is with reference to the relation of natural evil or suffering to moral evil or sin. There can be no strict separation between the two. The distinction has been pointed out as being, in general, the distinction between that which man suffers and that which he inflicts.[4] One

[1]Luke 13: 3, 5.
[2]Acts 17: 30, 31.
[3]Gal. 3: 13.
[4]Fairbairn, "Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 134.

is imposed upon man by the weakness and infirmity of his own nature and by the disorders of the natural world with which his life is inextricably bound up. The other he is responsible for as being the perversity of his own will.

To hold that there is no connection between the two would be an untenable position. That would bisect the world and destroy its unity. We can not allow that our world is thus divided. Two things that are so intimately interwoven in life must bear some causal connection.

Nor could we say that the connection is that sin is the outgrowth or expression of natural evil or human weakness. This is practically the view already discussed, that sin is human finiteness or limitation. Undoubtedly there is a close relation between man's physical and mental weaknesses and limitations as purely natural and much of his moral weakness and sin. But to make sin nothing but natural weakness or the result of it would contradict the clear posits of conscience and the plain teachings of Scripture. This would not explain sin; it would explain it away.

For one thing we know that much of human suffering is directly and indirectly due to man's sin. Both the man who sins and others as well suffer because of his sins. The connection is not always easy to trace but often it is obvious. If all the suffering of mankind due to its own perversity were taken out of the world's history, that history would make quite different reading. Here the connection is so obvious that we do not have any trouble tracing it. We can not always trace the connection in detail but the broad outlines are plain.

But what about the sufferings due to the disorders of nature herself, the cyclones, floods, earthquakes, volcanoes, etc? There is an indication in Genesis and other places that there is a connection between natural evil

and the sin of man. In Genesis work or labor is to be a part of man's penalty. This does not mean that work or activity as such is a part of the penalty, for man was to keep the garden even before the fall. And after redemption there is to be activity. God's servants will serve him.[1] Heaven is to be no place for inactivity. But the fact that man is to earn his bread in the sweat of his brow indicates that the element of burdensome labor came in because of sin.[2] Then it is said that the earth should bear thorns and thistles for man.[3] This may be taken as a particular statement indicating that natural evil in general came because of man's sin and as a part of the penalty. Paul's statement in Rom. 8: 18-22 may indicate that the whole physical universe is to be renovated and renewed as a part of God's redemptive plan.[4]

Some have concluded because of the statement in Genesis that there was no suffering, no animal death, no natural evil of any kind in the world before man sinned. But this is a precarious position for several reasons. In the first place, there is no clear teaching any where in the Bible to the effect that all suffering, animal death, and all natural evil, are the penalty of man's sin. This is rather an inference from such statements as we find in Genesis 3: 17-19; Rom. 8: 19-22; 2 Pet. 3: 13. These statements do not clearly and unmistakably teach the position under consideration. And we must distinguish betwen the clear teaching of Scripture and our own inferences from some more or less vague statements of Scripture. Where the statements are not clear and definite, it becomes us to practice a modest reserve in our affirmations.

Then another thing to remember is that even if one holds that natural evil, in whole or in part, is the penalty of man's sin, still it is not necessary to hold that man's sin preceded in the order of time the appearance of

[1]Rev. 22: 3.
[2]Gen. 3: 19.
[3]Gen. 3: 18.
[4]Cf 2 Peter 3: 13.

natural evil in the world. The order in which things come in the purpose of God is not necessarily the order in which they appear in the temporal order. The disorder and natural disturbances of the world may have been intended, whether meant strictly as penalty or not, to remind man of his own sin and need of redemption. Perhaps the disorder of the physical universe is intended as a reflection of the disorder of the moral universe. Unless we are going to hold to a form of dualism, or make the physical universe the primary factor of which the moral is simply a reflection, then it seems that the physical is in point of purpose and intention a reflection of the moral and spiritual. Yet this would not necessitate the reconstruction of the physical world at the time of man's sin, with a reversal of the laws of the physical world. The imperfections and disorders of the physical may have been of the nature of "anticipative consequences." God could have made the physical universe to correspond to the foreknown condition of the moral world. If God could not do that, he did not have as much foresight and power of adjustment as does a man who builds his house with reference to conditions of weather that he knows will come in the climate in which he builds. So the statement in Genesis[1] does not necessitate that thorns and thistles began to grow only after man sinned. It is no more necessary to hold that thorns and thistles first began to grow after man sinned than it is to hold that God changed the laws of the refraction of light after the flood so that the rainbow should first appear. In each case it is probable that the divine wisdom selected certain natural phenomena already in existence as a sign to man. The history of the natural world would indicate that animal death was operative before man appeared in the world, and there is no good reason for holding that Scripture teaches differently.

[1] 3: 18.

But whatever may be said about natural evil in general as being in whole or in part penal in its nature, there is no question that specific forms of suffering are at times the direct or indirect result of man's sin. Nor is there any good reason for denying that this suffering is of the nature of a penalty for man's sin. Sometimes these evil results come to the one who commits the sin; sometimes they fall upon others. Such evil consequences sometimes come as the result of the violation of moral or spiritual law. The Old Testament especially emphasizes that sickness and death as the shortening of life came as a result of sin and disobedience to God.[1]

While this can not be made an inexorable law, at least not to the extent of saying that one's condition of worldly prosperity is an infallible index to one's spiritual condition; i. e., that misfortune is always a sign that one is a great sinner, or that prosperity is a sign of righteousness,[2] still it is true that righteousness promotes good health and prosperity, both in the nation and the individual, and also that sin tends to shorten life and bring unhappiness and woe. Experience and observation also justify the conclusion that specific evils often follow immorality and sin.

To a limited extent, at least, then, natural evil or suffering may be regarded as the penalty of sin, or as a punishment for sin.

When we come to the doctrine of providence as related to grace we will see that suffering or natural evil serves another purpose in relation to sin; that is, it is used as a means under grace for the development of Christian character; it serves a redemptive end. This we know both from the teaching of Scripture and from Christian experience. This is involved in the saying of Jesus about the blind man in John 9. He says in substance to the disciples that they will never understand

[1]Ex. 20: 12; Prov. 3: 1, 2; 10: 27. [2]See Book of Job and John 9: 1ff.

suffering and misfortune so long as they try to interpret it exclusively as the infliction of penalty for sin; they must see it as related to God's benevolent purpose toward mankind. We must remember that every phase of life is to be interpreted from the point of view of God's redemptive purpose in Christ. Law and penalty do not speak the final word. They speak a true word, but the final word is spoken by grace and truth as revealed in Jesus Christ. There is a penal aspect to suffering or natural evil; but there is also a redemptive aspect. For the man who rejects grace, suffering is primarily penal; for the redeemed man, it is primarily remedial and disciplinary. For society in general, in proportion as sin reigns, it is primarily penal; as grace reigns, it is redemptive. We know that the race has got much of its development, mental, social and moral, by striving to overcome natural evil.

3. Death as the penalty of sin. There are places in the Bible where the penalty of sin is summed up in the word death. God said to Adam: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."[1] Paul said: "The wages of sin is death."[2] Speaking of an unrighteous life he says: "The end of those things is death."[3] He says again that the mind of the flesh is death.[4]

The question arises as to whether this includes physical death, or is the penalty here spoken of spiritual death? There are places in the Bible where death clearly means spiritual death; for instance, when Jesus said: "He that liveth and believeth on me shall never die."[5] He certainly does not mean that one who believes in him shall never die physically. But ordinarily death includes physical death. This is certainly so in the language of Paul. This is evident in 1 Cor. 15 where he discusses the resurrection over against death. He also

[1]Gen. 2: 17.
[2]Rom. 6: 23.
[3]Rom. 6: 21.
[4]Rom. 8: 6.
[5]John 11: 26.

means to include physical death in Rom. 5 when he talks about the universal sway of death as the result of Adam's sin. When the Scriptures speak of death as the penalty of sin, they do not mean either physical or spiritual death to the exclusion of the other, but they mean death as a totality, both physical and spiritual, the death of the whole man. There may be places where one aspect is emphasized, but neither phase of death is excluded.

Doubtless it would be true to say that the chief thing in the penalty of sin is spiritual death. That is the primary thing. But physical death follows as a result of spiritual death. We might look at this in relation to the statement that God made to Adam: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."[1] It has been objected that this could not mean physical death, for Adam did not die physically the day he disobeyed. But he did die spiritually. His communion and fellowship with God were broken. He was also driven out of the garden of Eden so that he no longer had access to the tree of life and hence died physically. One has to recognize that he cannot be too dogmatic in interpreting certain features of this account, but the most reasonable and consistent interpretation seems to be that the tree of life was intended to give immortality to man's body. Man was not created immortal, but mortal as to his body, but with a provision for attaining physical immortality provided he remained obedient to God. Spiritual life would have been the result of continued obedience to God; physical immortality would have come from partaking of the tree of life. But when he disobeyed God, he was driven out from the tree of life and as a result died. What was said in the preceding section about natural evil as related to sin will apply largely to physical death, because physical death is the summation

[1]Gen. 2: 17.

and consummation of natural evil. We can sum the matter up, then, by saying that for the Christian physical death is primarily redemptive and disciplinary; for the unredeemed man it becomes exclusively penal.

Looking upon the penalty of sin as being primarily spiritual and secondarily as physical death helps us also with reference to another phase of the matter. It agrees with the fact that in salvation we are first and primarily saved from spiritual death in regeneration and sanctification; but this carries with it the resurrection of the body as the consummation and completion of salvation. Just as physical death resulted from the breaking of man's fellowship with God, so the restoration of fellowship with God carries as a consequence the salvation of the body. In the order of importance and causation, it is first the spiritual, then the physical.

The final and complete penalty of sin is eternal death, what is spoken of as the second death in the book of Revelation.[1] This is the banishment of soul and body from the presence of God forever. This will be discussed when we come to consider the subject of eschatology.

[1] 2: 11; 20: 6, 14; 21: 8.

PART FOUR

The Christian Doctrine of Salvation

CHAPTER I

GOD'S PURPOSE OF REDEMPTION

I. God's purpose in its racial aspects.
   1. Indications of religious history.
   2. Old Testament teaching and history.
   3. New Testament and Christian history.

II. God's purpose as related to the individual.
   1. Meaning of election.
      (1) All saving efficiency is of God.
      (2) He saves in pursuance of an eternal purpose.
      (3) All credit for man's salvation belongs to God.
   2. Proof for the doctrine.
      (1) Principle seen in Old Testament.
      (2) Taught in New Testament.
      (3) Inference from sovereignty and omniscience of God.
      (4) Seen in Christian experience.
   3. Objections.
      (1) That it makes God partial.
      Answer:
      a. God does not in any respect bestow equal blessings on men.
      b. He works through natural and social means.
      (2) That it is unjust to the non-elect.
      Answer:
      a. God does not put anything in the way of any man's salvation.
      b. All God does for the sinner is a matter of grace.
      c. The only barrier is in the sinner.
      d. Doubtless limitations placed on God by man's freedom and sins.
      e. None would have been saved without God's decree and efficiency.
      (3) That it is inconsistent with man's freedom.
      Answer:

God does not save man against his will, but makes him willing.

(4) That it discourages effort for the salvation of men. Answer:

It rather guarantees success, since God works in and through us according to his eternal purpose.

If what has been said about God as a God of intelligence and power who is sovereign over the world is true, then we must believe that he has a purpose with reference to the world and man that is being worked out in the course of human history. If we are correct in holding that Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord is God's final revelation of himself to man, then this purpose of God must be a redemptive purpose. If we are right in regard to man as a sinner in his relation to God, then redemption is man's chief need.

I. **God's purpose in its racial aspects.** We will first look at God's purpose of redemption in its more general aspects. We have seen how the race as a whole fell under condemnation and death. Is there any evidence that with reference to mankind as a whole God is working out a purpose? We believe there is.

1. The general religious history of man would indicate that God has planted in man an insatiable thirst for God so that man can never rest until he rests in God. Man's entire religious history is a record of man's search for God. But this search for God is the result of a disposition that God has implanted in man's soul. Surely this search is not all in vain and man's religious history is moving some whither.

2. We get clear indications of a redemptive purpose of God in Old Testament teaching and history. As soon as man sinned, there was a gleam of light that broke through the lowering clouds in the form of a promise to the woman—a promise that has its fulfilment only in Christ.[1] There was also a bow of promise that lighted

[1]Gen. 3: 15.

the destruction of the flood with its light of hope.[1] The call of Abraham marks a new era in the development of God's purpose of grace.[2] God entered into a covenant with Abraham and his descendants by which they were made his special people for a great purpose in the world. They were not made his people, however, to the exclusion of the other nations. They were rather to be a blessing to the other nations.[3] Israel was to be Jehovah's missionary to the nations.[4] Israel, however, as a nation misinterpreted her mission. She took her call to mean the exclusion of the other nations, and, therefore, she became proud and arrogant in her spirit. Yet it is the great paradox of history that Israel did not fail, because out of her came the Redeemer, the one through whom God's redemptive purpose should be accomplished and who is, therefore, the fulfilment of all that was involved in God's ideal for national Israel. Old Testament history and teaching moved to their purpose and goal in Jesus Christ.

3. Beginning with Christ we have further evidence of a world-wide purpose of God. We have the evidence of this in the doctrine of the kingdom of God in the New Testament. That kingdom was initiated with the coming and work of Christ.[5] He tells that the kingdom that began in such insignificant smallness is to become a mighty affair.[6] Many shall come from all directions (Gentiles) and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom while the sons of the kingdom (Jews) will be cast out.[7] The aged Simeon greets the babe Jesus as the one who should bring a salvation which God had prepared before the face of all people. He was to be a light for revelation to the Gentiles as well as the glory of Israel.[8] Jesus commands that his

[1]Gen. 9: 9-17.
[2]Gen. 12: 1ff.
[3]Gen. 12: 2, 3.
[4]Isa. 42: 1ff.
[5]Matt. 3: 2; Mark 1: 15.
[6]Matt. 13: 31-33.
[7]Matt. 8: 11, 12.
[8]Luke 2: 31, 32.

gospel be preached to all nations.[1] The book of Acts narrates how the gospel broke through Jewish bounds and began to lay hold on the Gentile world. Paul carried the gospel to the very center, even to Rome. Others had even preceded him there, for there was a church in Rome before Paul went there. It is made clear in Acts that the preaching of the word to Gentiles was done under divine guidance. Paul went to the Gentile world under a special call from God.[2] The book of Revelation gives us a graphic picture, mostly in symbolic language, of the final and complete triumph of God's kingdom. The struggle is long and hard, but complete and final triumph comes at last with the coming of the New Jerusalem down to earth from God.

II. **God's purpose as related to the salvation of the individual.**

1. The meaning of the doctrine. But the Scriptures teach, not only that God has a general plan that is being carried out in human history, but also that God's purpose applies to the individual. When a man is saved he is not saved as a matter of chance or accident or fate; he is saved in pursuance of an eternal purpose of God. God saves men because he intends to. He saves a particular man, at a particular time, under a given set of circumstances, because he intends to.

Election does not mean that God instituted a general plan of salvation and decreed that whosoever would should be saved and, therefore, the man who wills to be saved is elected in that he brings himself within the scope of God's plan. It is true that God has decreed that whosoever will shall be saved; but election is something more specific and personal than that. It means that God has decreed to bring certain ones, upon whom his heart has been eternally set, who are the objects of

[1]Matt. 28: 19; Luke 24: 47; Acts 1: 8. [2]Acts 13: 1ff and many other passages.

his eternal love, to faith in Jesus as Savior. The general meaning of the doctrine of election might be summed up in two statements:

(1) The first is that, when a sinner repents of his sins and believes in Christ to the saving of his soul, he does so because God has brought him to do so. Men do not turn from sin to God on their own initiative. God must move them to do so if ever they turn. This includes all good influences, all gospel agencies, all circumstances of environment, all inner dispositions and promptings of heart and conscience that enter into one's decision. It includes the whole historical order in which one is so situated as to have gospel privileges, and this order is viewed as being providential. Especially does it include the inner promptings and leadings of the Holy Spirit.

To regard one's conversion from sin to Christ as the work of God is the spontaneous impulse of the Christian heart. When a Christian hears of some one's turning from sin the first expression to come to his lips is "Thank God." But if this is not the work of God, then he should not be thanked. He does not deserve credit for what he does not do. This is the view of Scripture as well as the spontaneous impulse of the Christian heart. In the Bible salvation is everywhere attributed to God. To save is the work of God. But to save includes bringing about this change of mind and heart that we call conversion. It is not true that the sinner within and of himself repents and believes and then God comes into the process in forgiveness. No, God was in the process from the first. He works to produce repentance and faith. He works to bring about the conditions upon which he can forgive. He seeks the sinner. We yield to a God who draws us to himself. We seek him because he first sought us. The gospel of Christ is the gospel of a seeking God. He seeks worshipers.[1]

[1]John 4: 23.

The Son of man came to seek and to save the lost.[1] The seeking of the Son of man is a revelation of the heart of God. Drawing men to Christ is the work of God. Without this drawing power men can not come to Christ.[2]

Paul talks about God as calling men.[3] By this calling he seems to mean more than a general gospel invitation to men to be saved by the grace of God. Paul's use of the term seems to correspond rather to what Jesus speaks of as the drawing of God in John 6: 44. It is a dealing of God with the hearts of men that results in their coming to Christ and being saved. This efficacious call does not come to all, not even to all who hear the gospel. Some are called; to them the gospel is the power of God. To others the gospel is a stumbling-block or foolishness.[4] This call gives one a spiritual mind that enables him to get an insight into the meaning of the cross.

This drawing power of God is necessary, because man's natural inclinations are so opposed to God and righteousness that without it man will not come to God. Paul tells us that the carnal mind is enmity against God. It is not subject to the law of God. Its nature is such that it can not be.[5] Man must be born again, because that which is born of the flesh is flesh.[6] Hence one must die to sin.[7] The old man must be crucified.[8] One must deny himself and take up the cross to be a disciple of Jesus.[9]

(2) The second thing, the thing that really constitutes the doctrine of election, is that God saves in pursuance of an eternal purpose. What he does in bringing men to repentance and faith he has eternally purposed to do.

[1]Luke 19: 10.
[2]John 6: 44.
[3]Rom. 8: 28-30; 1 Cor. 1: 24. etc.
[4]1 Cor. 1: 23.
[5]Rom. 8: 7.
[6]John 3: 6.
[7]Rom. 6: 2.
[8]Rom. 6: 6.
[9]Matt. 16: 24.

Let us look at several particular phases of this idea.

a. This seems to involve a real choice on God's part antecedent to the choice of the man in choosing salvation. The elect are those whom God chooses.

b. This choice on God's part is an eternal choice. God chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world.[1]

c. In pursuance of his electing grace, God draws men to himself and saves them, upon condition of repentance and faith on their part.[2]

d. The thing to which God elects us is that we shall be holy and without blemish before him in love.[3] He foreordains us to be conformed to the image of his Son.[4] The goal that he has in mind for us is to make us like Christ, that we may be the first-born among many brethren. That means complete salvation.

e. This is to be to the praise of the glory of his grace.[5] It is a matter of grace on his part that he chose us. He did not choose us because we deserved it or earned it. Whatever may be the principle that guides in his choice, it does not seem to be the moral worth or fitness of the one chosen. No sinner has any claim on God in this respect. If this were the basis of the choice, then salvation would be, partly at least, a matter of merit on the sinner's part. But God sets his love on us as undeserving sinners. This is the dividing line that runs through all systems of theology. God's purpose is a purpose of grace.

We might sum up the doctrine of election by saying that it means:

(1) That all the efficacy and power in salvation is of God, even the power of making the sinner willing to be saved. The power of God is exerted to overcome man's opposition to his will. The bent of man's nature, the perversity of his will, is set against God. To save man

[1]Eph. 1: 4.
[2]John 6: 37; Acts 13: 48; Rom. 8: 30; Eph. 1: 3, 4.
[3]Eph. 1: 4.
[4]Rom. 8: 29.
[5]Eph. 1: 6.

means to overcome, by the power of God's grace, this hostility and bring man into humble, trustful submission to God.

(2) That what he does in saving he purposed to do from eternity; his work in saving is not done as a matter of chance or accident, does not come as an afterthought on God's part. It is his eternal plan. He saves man because he determined that he would do so in spite of all the opposition and the difficulties.

(3) It, therefore, means that all the credit for salvation belongs to God who, as a matter of grace, purposed and effected salvation for man. Man can not claim credit for salvation. He did not plan it; he did not accomplish it. He did not earn it; he did not deserve it. He only accepted a salvation which God purposed and provided for him, and accepted as a result of the wooing of God's grace which overcomes man's indifference and opposition.

2. Proof for the doctrine. We suggest here certain arguments in favor of this doctrine. (1) One is that we see the principle of election at work in the Old Testament. God chose Abraham and his descendants to be his people in a peculiar sense. He entered into covenant relations with them. This does not mean that other peoples and nations were shut out or were not responsible to Jehovah. They were responsible to him. He chastised the other nations for their sins and used them to chastise Israel. But there was a special relation established between him and Israel, and Jehovah took the initiative in establishing this relation.

(2) We find this doctrine clearly taught in the New Testament. God's people are frequently spoken of as the elect.[1] In the Old Testament, Israel as a nation constituted God's elect, but in Christianity it is not na-

[1]Matt. 24: 22; Luke 18: 7; 1 Peter 1: 1.

tional Israel that constitutes God's elect, but redeemed individuals, the spiritual Israel.

In John's Gospel, Jesus speaks of his disciples as those whom the Father had given him.[1] In some of these passages the giving is put in the past as if it might have been a pretemporal transaction in God's eternal purpose.[2] It seems to precede the coming to Christ on the part of his people. It might be synonymous with the drawing that results in their coming, but it is more probable that it refers to the eternal purpose of God in pursuance of which he draws men to Christ.

Peter speaks of Christians as elect according to the foreknowledge of God.[3] But perhaps the clearest statements on this question are to be found in the writings of Paul. One of Paul's clearest expressions on the subject is in Rom. 8: 29, 30. Here he grounds the providence of God in his predestinating grace. We find here a chain reaching from eternity past to eternity future. This chain is made up of the links of foreknowledge, predestination, calling, justification, glorification. To foreknow in the sense here spoken of is more than to know intellectually. In the latter sense God foreknows all men. It means to set his heart on us, to know us for our good. The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly shall perish.[4] In the day of reckoning the Lord will send away the workers of iniquity because he never knew them.[5] God set his heart upon the objects of his predestinating grace in eternity, and in pursuance of his eternal purpose he calls, justifies and glorifies.

In Rom. 9 Paul asserts the sovereignty of God in strong language. He quotes the Old Testament to the effect that God has mercy on whom he will and whom he will he hardens.[6] He uses the case of Jacob and

[1]John 6: 37, 39; 17: 2, 6.
[2]John 17: 2, 24.
[3]1 Peter 1: 1, 2.
[4]Ps. 1: 6.
[5]Matt. 7: 23.
[6]Vs. 15.

Esau as an example. Unless we compare this with what Paul says in other cases, we would get the impression that God was arbitrary in his dealings with men. Certainly Paul meant to assert that he was sovereign in bestowing his grace upon sinners.

In Paul's great declaration concerning grace in Eph. 1:3-14, he grounds the whole thing on God's predestinating grace. God has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in Christ in pursuance of the fact that he chose us in him before the foundation of the world; having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself.[1] Again he sets forth that we were made a heritage in as much as we were foreordained according to the purpose of him who works all things after the counsel of his own will.[2]

(3) In the third place, the doctrine of predestination or election is an inescapable inference from the doctrine of a sovereign and omniscient God. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning. If all the events of the universe were known to God from the beginning and God ordained the world, then God ordained all that was involved in the history of the world. If God creates and sustains the world and is a God of intelligence; if the world in its totality and, therefore, in its details is grounded in God, then he has ordained the whole world system and each detail of that system. This is not saying that God sustains the same relation to the evil that he does to the good, nor that each event of the world order is ordained for its own sake or out of its connection; but it is saying that each event is ordained in its connections in the world system as a part of that system. Nor does this mean that God sustains the same relation to an event in nature that he does to a free act of man. Each is ordained in its connections and under its conditions. An event in nature is ordained as an event in

[1]Vss. 3, 4. [2]Vs. 11.

nature and man's free act as a free act. A deed of holiness is ordained as something that God as the Author of all good produces, and a sinful act is ordained as something which a God who respects man's freedom permits man to do, in spite of God's hatred of sin. God ordains to permit the deed rather than interfere with man's freedom.

To put the matter another way, election is saying that what God does in saving men he does because he purposed to do it. We are arguing on the assumption that as a God of wisdom he has a purpose that is being carried out in the history of the world, and that as a God of power he does all that he purposes to do. If these two propositions are accepted, election must be accepted. God does not save all men. He does save some men. Hence God did not purpose to save all, but did purpose to save some.

Moreover, if it is right that God should save some men and not save others, it is right that he should purpose to save some and not save others. One could not consistently object to God's purposing to do what one does not object to his doing.

It has been truly said, therefore, that an argument against election is an argument for universalism. Let us make that statement a little more evident. Granting the fact of sin, God could plan to do one of three things: save none and condemn all, save all and condemn none, or save some and condemn some. If God planned to do either the first or the second, there would be no election. All would be treated alike. But the third plan necessarily involves election. Any plan by which some are saved and others lost necessitates that God should choose to save some and not save others.

(4) Another argument for election is the argument from Christian experience. As we look back upon our experience, we recognize two things as outstanding in

our conversion. One is God's drawing us, and the other is our resistance to his drawing. We were saved when we ceased to resist and yielded to the God of all grace. We love him because he first loved us.[1] Our experience, therefore, testifies that he chose us before we chose him. He sought us before we sought him. Our seeking was in response to his seeking. Our love was in response to his love. He took the initiative in our salvation.

It is sometimes objected that this makes the sinner helpless and dependent on God. That is exactly what it does. And that is exactly what the sinner needs to recognize—his absolute dependence on God. Faith does recognize that. Faith is assuming the attitude of entire dependence on God. Nothing else is faith. Refusing to assume this attitude is what keeps a man out of the kingdom of God. The desire to be self-sufficient and independent of God is the heart of the sin principle in our lives.

3. Objections to the doctrine. Most of the difficulties and objections with reference to election grow out of misinterpretations of the doctrines and hasty inferences from it. The answer to the objections, therefore, will take the form mainly of clearing up the difficulties by correcting the false interpretations of the doctrine and showing that the hasty inferences are not proper conclusions from the doctrine. In other words, the way to answer the objections to the doctrine is to set forth the doctrine more fully and correctly.

(1) One objection to this doctrine is that it makes God partial. People often quote in opposition to this doctrine Peter's saying that God is no respecter of persons.[2] But the context, especially the rest of Peter's sentence, makes it clear that what Peter meant is that God does not accept a man because he is a Jew or reject him because he is a Gentile. God has respect to the

[1] 1 John 4: 19. [2] Acts 10: 34.

state of the heart rather than national or artificial distinctions in his dealings with men.

Most likely there is lurking in the mind of the one making this objection the assumption that God is under obligation to bestow equal privileges, opportunities and blessings on men. But as a matter of fact, God does not bestow equal blessings on men with reference to natural gifts. Men are not equal in looks, physical or mental ability, moral and spiritual endowments. He gives to one five talents, to another two, to another one. The Spirit bestows his gifts on men, to each one severally as he will.[1] When one thanks God that he was born in a Christian land or of Christian parents, or for good health, he is recognizing the fact that God has given him blessings that he has not given to many others. The same is true if he thanks God for salvation. But the objector might say that, so far as natural blessings are concerned, these could not be equal because they come to us through natural means and in a social order that necessarily makes a difference among men. We reply: "May not the same thing apply in regard to religious blessings and opportunities?" These also are mediated to us through natural, social, historical means, and it might be as impossible for God to reduce men to a common level of privilege and blessings here as in the case of natural gifts. Religious blessings themselves come at least partly through natural means. To put all men on a level of religious privileges might necessitate that God take men out of the natural, historical, social connections in which they live. So the fact that God bestows more blessings on some men than on others does not mean that he is "partial" in an arbitrary way.

One thing we can say is that God bestows more blessings on each of us than he deserves. His blessings all flow to us out of his goodness and his grace. What God

[1] 1 Cor. 12: 11.

is under obligation to do is, not to bestow equal grace on all men, but that he do no injustice to any. It will be shown in the next section that he is just to all.

(2) Another objection is that it is unjust to the non-elect since it makes his salvation impossible. If man is unable to come without the special drawing power of the Spirit and this is not given, then why is the sinner to blame? This, the objector says, would hold the sinner responsible for not doing something which he could not do.

But this objection misconceives the matter. It assumes that, if God deserves the credit for the salvation of the saved, he, therefore, is responsible for the condemnation of the lost. This is not true. The following things need to be kept in mind:

a. It must be remembered that God does not put anything in the way of the salvation of any man. He does not prevent the coming of any man. God wills not the death of any man, but desires that all should come to repentance.[1] The doctrine of election is not contrary to this, but it goes further. It says that, not only does God desire the salvation of all, but he also positively decreed the salvation of some. There may be reasons in the nature of God or man, the moral relations of the two, or the moral order of the world that place a limitation on God in carrying out his desire. Evidently there are reasons why he should not save all. God is not an arbitrary despot. He has good reasons for what he does. The fact that God does not save all is evidence that there are limitations on God that constitute sufficient reasons why he should not save all. We can safely say that God does all that he can consistently with his own nature, the nature of man, and the moral order of the world to save all men.

[1]Ezek. 18: 23, 32; 33: 11; 1 Tim. 2: 3, 4; 2 Peter 3: 9.

b. No injustice is done the sinner because whatever God does for him is a matter of grace. God desires his salvation. He has provided salvation for him in Christ. He gives him the invitation. He brings influences to bear to bring him into the way of life. All this is grace. If in spite of these things the sinner will not come, he has nobody to blame but himself. As long as he is unwilling to receive the grace that God offers him, he can not complain because God does not give him more grace.

c. The sinner's inability is an inability only so long as the sinner refuses to recognize his dependence on God. If he wants to come, he can come. The difficulty is on his part, not on God's. The barrier is in the sinner. The only difficulty is in the sinner's attitude toward God. For that attitude he is responsible.

d. But why did God not elect all? Why did he elect some and not elect others? As stated above, evidently there was some good reason why God should not save all. Or to put it another way, there were limitations placed on God in the matter that prevent him from carrying out his desire to see all men saved. Perhaps man's freedom and sinful perversity have something to do with it. We would be safe in saying that whatever aspects of the situation God takes account of in saving men these he took account of in electing men to salvation. If this be not true, then God is inconsistent with himself. Perhaps we make a mistake in thinking of the matter as if God elected a man to salvation as an isolated individual, without reference to the moral and historical connections in which the man lives. Evidently this is a mistaken idea. Whatever God's purpose concerning any man may be that purpose must relate to him in the total environment in which he lives. He is not elected simply as a detached individual. He is elected as a member of the race living in a certain moral and historical environment. Nor is he elected simply to eternal salva-

tion, merely as a brand snatched from the eternal burnings. He is elected with reference to the total meaning and mission of his life as a member of the race. God's purpose with reference to any man's life is a part of his purpose for the race.

It does not seem that one man is elected to salvation and another not, on the ground that the man elected is morally more deserving than the one not elected. All men are under condemnation. All are sinners. God's purpose to save any is a purpose of grace. Does God's election of one man to salvation imply that he passes over the one not elected simply because he does not desire his salvation? No; he desires the salvation of all. Does God purpose not to save the man that he does not save? Yes; he purposes to do what he does. Since he does not save him, he does not purpose to save him. But it should also be remembered that God does not save the sinner, because of the sinner's perverse and stubborn unbelief. Hence it follows that the reason God purposes not to save the sinner was because of the sinner's foreknown unbelief. To state it positively, God purposes to condemn the sinner on the ground on which he does condemn him; namely, because the sinner's attitude is such that God can not consistently save him. God gives him over to his own doom because he would not be saved.

But it may be asked: "Does not the fact that God purposes to condemn one man because of his foreknown unbelief, carry with it the idea that he elected another because of his foreseen faith?" No; election means more than that. It means that God purposed to produce the faith that is the condition of salvation. There is no faith to foresee except the faith God produces. He does not produce man's unbelief. God deserves credit for man's faith; man deserves the blame for his unbelief.

e. While God's decree of election does not stand in the way of any man's being saved, on the other hand such a decree was a necessity. Some one says: "Why should God not provide salvation, send out the universal invitation and leave every man to accept or reject as he would, without any previous choice or decree on God's part?"

But God could not create a world and leave that world to ruin on uncertainties. A God of wisdom will not simply have a general plan. The wiser one is who originates a system, the more completely will the details be worked out in his mind beforehand. In the infinite mind nothing was left to chance or uncertainty.

Besides, without a decree of election, none would have been saved. If the invitation had been sent out and each man left to his own inclination, no one would have come. Man's moral nature is so perverted and darkened by sin that he would not turn from sin to righteousness without the recreative power of God's almighty grace.

(3) Another objection to election is that it is inconsistent with the freedom of man. The objector says that if some men were elected to salvation and others not, this would put man in the hands of an inexorable fate, things would be fixed beforehand and there would be no use for any man to seek to be saved.

But we must remember that God's decree of election is not to the effect that a man shall be saved irrespective of whether he repents and believes. Rather it is a decree on God's part to bring this man to repentance and faith. And God does not compel the elect to believe. He so leads and persuades them by the gracious influences of the gospel and the wooings of his Spirit that they choose to come to Christ.

"But," says the objector, "how can a man's salvation or final condemnation be rendered certain in God's mind and purpose and the man himself be free with reference

to the matter?" As to how it can be, perhaps we can not solve that problem. But that it is that way is certain. To deny this one would have to deny, not only election, but also God's foreknowledge, because God can not foreknow any event unless it is certain that the event will come to pass. But the objector holds that certainty is inconsistent with freedom on man's part. This at one stroke would do away with all prediction in prophecy. The New Testament writers put these two things side by side with no sense of inconsistency or contradiction. Jesus said concerning his own betrayal: "The Son of man goeth, as it hath been determined; but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed."[1]

Speaking of the crucifixion of Jesus, Peter, on the day of Pentecost, said: "Him, being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay."[2] Jesus and Peter seemed to think that Judas and those who slew Jesus were perfectly free in carrying out what had been before determined in the mind and purpose of God.

Ar Dr. Strong[3] points out, if anything interferes with the freedom of man, it would not be God's purpose concerning our salvation, but what God does in carrying out his purpose. If God's dealings with us in saving us do not interfere with our freedom, certainly his purpose formed in eternity to do what he does would not interfere. The question then becomes: Does God's work in saving us from sin interfere with the autonomy of the one who is saved? The answer of every saved man is that in his experience of salvation his moral self-determination was not interfered with. On the other hand, he feels that in the experience of salvation he was lifted to a plane of freedom that he had not known before.

Let us remember that God's purpose of election was God's purpose to do in saving a man just what he does

[1]Luke 22: 22.
[2]Acts 2: 23.
[3]"Sys. Theol.," section on election.

when he saves him. Therefore if saving the man does not interfere with his freedom, the purpose in God's mind in pursuance of which he was saved certainly would not do so.

This question is simply one phase of the relation of man as finite and free to God as absolute and sovereign. This question has already been discussed. The religious consciousness, particularly Christian faith, holds tenaciously to both the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man.

(4) A fourth objection to election is that it discourages effort on the part of Christians for the salvation of others. The objector says that, if the matter is fixed one way or the other, then effort on our part is useless since we can not change what is fixed.

This objection also is founded on a misunderstanding. The doctrine of election does not hold that the salvation of any man is fixed as a matter of fate, or even rendered certain irrespective of conditions. God does not decree that he will save a certain man whether he ever hears the gospel or not, or whether he repents and believes or not. Rather is it God's purpose so to direct the providential factors of the man's life as to bring him under gospel influences and so to incline his heart that he will turn from sin to God.

This doctrine, on the other hand, is an encouragement to Christian effort, if the doctrine is properly understood. One of the values of the doctrine is that it assures us, not only that God desires the salvation of men, but that his heart has been eternally set upon that very thing and that he planned the world with reference to it and so directs it in his providence that men shall be saved. It assures us that the purpose to redeem men from sin is the deepest thing in the mind and purpose of God from all eternity. What better encouragement than that could one wish to work at the task of saving men from

sin? If this is God's eternal concern, it should be our concern and task. We can work at it with the assurance that we work in line with his eternal purposes and that he works in us and through us.

The Hardshell philosophy on this point was that, if God purposes that a thing should be done, we should leave him to do it. But a truer philosophy says that, if God purposes that a thing should be done, we should for that very reason undertake to see that it is done. And if God purposes that it should be done, that is our assurance that we can do it and our encouragement in doing it. If God calls me to preach, I have the assurance that my work will not be in vain. He will give me fruit from my labor. Wherever he directs me to work, I have the assurance that he has a work there to do and I can do it with his help. Paul's assurance as he labored at Corinth was that the Lord had much people in that city, and, therefore, the Lord would be with him and no man should harm him while he labored there.[1]

Conclusion. We have seen that unless God took the initiative in our salvation and drew us to himself, no man would be saved. We have just seen also that the doctrine of election is an encouragement to us in doing Christian work in that it assures us that our work will not be in vain in the Lord. Later on we will see that it is the basis of the doctrine of providence and of the safety of the believer. Election is the basal idea in the doctrine of salvation by grace.

[1]Acts 18: 10.

CHAPTER II

THE ATONING WORK OF CHRIST

I. A test of systems of theology.
   1. Their view as to God.
   2. Their view as to moral law.
   3. Their view as to sin.

II. The doctrine of the atonement stated.
   1. The fact of atonement.
      (1) Our salvation Christ's achievement.
      (2) His death his redemptive act.
      (3) His death and life inseparable.
         a. The sinless one died for sinners.
         b. His whole life one of self-sacrifice.
      (4) His death as a saving act consummated in the resurrection.
      (5) His death "according to the Scriptures."
   2. The motive of the atonement—the love of God.
   3. The atonement and a holy God.
      (1) The moral difficulty created by sin.
      (2) How Christ's death meets the difficulty.
         a. He died on behalf of sinners.
         b. He bore our curse.
         c. His death was propitiatory.
         d. His death was substitutionary.
      (3) An objection considered.
         Objection: It is not just that one should bear another's sins.
         Answer:
         a. It is a law of life that one should suffer for another's wrongs.
         b. It is the highest expression of love that one should willingly suffer for another.
         c. Christ voluntarily died for men.
         d. He was more than a human individual; he was the eternal Son of God.
   4. Faith and atonement.

III. False or inadequate theories of the atonement.
  1. The example theory.
    (1) The theory stated.
    (2) Objections.
      a. Not the Christian view.
      b. Are the sufferings of Jesus imitable by us?
  2. The moral influence theory.
    (1) The view stated.
    (2) The view refuted.
      a. Reduces guilt to a guilt-consciousness without objective ground.
      b. Furnishes no rational connection between the death of Christ and the end to be accomplished by it.
      c. Not true to New Testament teaching on the subject.
  3. The governmental theory.
    (1) The view stated.
    (2) Makes moral law arbitrary.
  4. The commercial theory.
    (1) The view stated.
    (2) View one-sided in trying to interpret the atonement altogether in terms of payment of a debt.
  5. Eternal atonement.
    (1) The view stated.
    (2) Values and failures of the view.

IV. The intercession of Christ.
  1. Based on sacrificial work.
  2. Living Christ still active on our behalf.
  3. Blessings secured by intercession.
  4. Confidence toward God through our High Priest.

We have seen something of the extent of sin in the human race and the ruin wrought by it. We have also considered God's purpose of grace, both as to the race and as to the individual. This purpose of God to save finds its revelation and means of accomplishment in Jesus Christ. Christ is Savior. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins."[1] "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which is lost."[2] "Faithful is the saying and worthy

[1]Matt. 1: 21. [2]Luke 19: 10.

of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."[1]

I. **A test of systems of theology.** We have come to a place now where systems of theology are tested. Any system of theology can be pretty well judged by its answer to the questions: Did Jesus Christ do anything that makes possible the sinner's salvation? Was there such a breach of relationship between God and man on account of man's sin as to necessitate anything more as a condition of salvation than a change of attitude on the sinner's part? Was there a moral difficulty on God's part that must be taken care of before God could forgive the sinner's sin and receive him to divine favor? Is the forgiveness of sins based upon the sacrificial work of Christ?

The answer a system of theology gives to these questions will depend upon its view with reference to certain other fundamental questions in theology. Most of these questions have been under consideration in the preceding pages, but for the sake of making clear the radical differences between the two systems of theology spoken of, and as a means of getting a proper approach to the question of Christ's atoning work, we will look at these questions again. Whatever differences there may be between these two systems of theology on other points, they hold opposing positions on the following fundamental questions:

1. As to God. Is there anything in God's moral nature that can be described as retributive wrath? One system of theology holds that God is love and only love. It considers that the idea that God can become angry and visit wrath upon any of his creatures is an anthropomorphic way of viewing the matter that we should have outgrown by this time. This idea, we are told, is only a projection into the religious world of man's sense of

[1] 1 Tim. 1: 15.

fear and a result of his attributing to God sentiments which man himself cherishes towards those who injure him or oppose his plans. So it is held by one system.

But is it not just as anthropomorphic to attribute love to God as it is to attribute wrath to him? In either case, the idea that we attribute to God has its origin in human experience. The question is not what the source of the idea is, but whether or not it is a worthy quality to attribute to God and whether it is true. One thing is certain. The Scriptures everywhere look upon God as having moral indignation toward man's sin. At the very first, God's curse comes upon Adam for his sin. The same is true of Cain. Then the flood came upon the whole race as a judgment of God. There is nothing that comes out more clearly than this in Old Testament history and teaching. It stands out prominently upon practically every page of the Old Testament. God is angry with the wicked every day.[1]

This is true of the New Testament. Jesus teaches that men should fear the one who has power to destroy both soul and body in hell.[2] Jesus repeatedly warns men against the danger of punishment in the world to come.[3] In Rom. 1: 18 Paul teaches that the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against the sins of men. Then he goes on to show how this brings all men under condemnation and the need of justification by grace.[4] Both Jew and Gentile are condemned. This condemnation is an expression of what Paul calls the wrath of God. In John's Gospel we find the same thing. Men are under judgment because they love darkness rather than light and consequently their deeds are evil.[5]

This does not mean that God flies into a passion as men do. But it does mean that there is a principle of

[1]Ps. 7: 11, 12.
[2]Matt. 10: 28.
[3]Matt. 25: 41ff; Mark 9: 42ff; Luke 16: 19ff.
[4]Rom. 1: 18—3: 20.
[5]John 3: 19-21.

holiness in him that must take account of sin in his relation to men. A God that did not condemn sin, that treated the righteous and the wicked alike, would not be a moral God. A good man is not one who has no moral indignation against evil. A man who never becomes indignant when he sees injustice ruling with a high hand in human relations is not a good man. He is a man without a properly developed moral consciousness. The same thing would be true of a God who disregarded sin in his relations with men.

We see in the case of Jesus that he had moral indignation against sin. We are told that one time he looked round about upon them with anger.[1] He denounced the scribes and Pharisees with scathing language.[2] He told the Jewish leaders that they were the children of the devil and did the works of their father.[3]

Now it will be generally agreed by all classes of theologians that claim to be Christian that the human character of Jesus Christ is the highest revelation of the moral character of God the world has known. If so, then if there is the element of severity and moral indignation against sin in the character of Jesus, there must be the same quality in the character of God.

2. Another place where systems of theology divide is at the point of moral law. What is moral law? Is there such a thing as moral law that is universally binding on men as rational and moral beings? Is moral law a revelation of the righteous will of God and does it demand righteousness of man? Are there eternal and unchangeable principles of righteousness, grounded in the moral nature of God and a revelation of that nature? Or, on the other hand, is moral law only an evolution of certain principles that have been discovered in the course of human experience to be expedient in as much as obedience to these principles has proved to be bene-

[1]Mark 3: 5. [2]Matt. 23. [3]John 8: 44.

ficial and disobedience harmful? Is the requirement of moral law a sliding scale that may vary with time and circumstances? Is moral law transcendant in its source and sanctions or is it something growing up altogether out of experience and finding its sanctions only in experience?

Unquestionably the Scriptural view is that moral law is the revelation of the will of God, having its source in the moral nature of God, and that its principles are, therefore, eternal and unchangeable. Its demands are something that came down upon man from a higher realm, not simply something growing up out of experience as a utilitarian matter. Moral law is something imposed on man. Right and the will of God are identical. Moral law everywhere has its supernatural sanctions and its inevitable penalties for disobedience.

As an example, take the decalogue. The commandments are given as commandments from God. Moses was only the medium of God in revealing his will. Disobedience was to be followed with a sure punishment. We find the same principles operative in the case of the prophets of the Old Testament. These prophets were the messengers of God. They spoke God's will. What God spoke through them was the eternal truth.

The requirements of the moral law were not nullified in the teachings of Jesus. Rather they were heightened and intensified. The requirements of the moral law as set forth by Jesus became more spiritual, inner and searching. Righteousness was not a matter of externals. It was a matter of the heart, the inner life. But there was a moral law. Its demands were unrelenting.

The book of Romans makes it clear that Paul believed in the world as under moral law. The demands of this law were revealed to man in nature, conscience and the Old Testament Scriptures. A failure to meet the requirements of this law as thus known brought condemnation upon both Jew and Gentile.

3. Another point of fundamental difference in systems of theology is with reference to sin. If sin is regarded as being only weakness and limitation, or as a disease for which man is not responsible, a kind of social infection, then of course no atonement is needed. Sin is sometimes regarded, not as a violation of an objective moral order, nor as an offence against a holy God who must condemn sin as guilty but only as a failure to achieve one's own highest ideals, or a failure to function properly in the social order to which one belongs. On the other hand, we have tried to show that sin involves guilt or ill desert on man's part, since it is sin against a holy God; and, as holy, God must condemn man as guilty.

The alternative as to sin might be put as follows: Is sin simply the shortcomings of man in his upward strivings, the checks and setbacks that he receives in upward moral progress; or is it a fall from a higher to a lower plane? Is it that which is only relatively bad, bad in the sense that it is an act or attitude or moral state that is not as good as it ought to be; or is it something that is absolutely wrong, something absolutely forbidden by the will of God, diametrically opposed to his will and, therefore, condemned by his will?

To put it another way: Is man's sense of guilt and condemnation something that is objectively real, as a result of the violation of an objective moral law, or is man's sense of guilt and condemnation only a psychological state to which no objective reality corresponds? In other words, is there real guilt of sin as against a holy God whose moral law has been transgressed or is there only a guilt-consciousness? Does man need saving from a guilt that condemns him or does he only need to be delivered from his feeling of guilt?

Accepting the view, then, that man is a sinner, guilty and condemned by a holy God, the question becomes: What did Christ do to save him?

II. **The doctrine of the atonement stated.**

1. The fact of atonement. It will probably help us first to consider some points that stand out in the teaching of the New Testament.

(1) In the first place, it is made clear that Christ did something on which man's salvation depended. Our salvation was his achievement. This is shown by such statements as that of Jesus when he said that the Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many.[1] Whatever else this may mean, it shows that he did something that was necessary for our liberation from sin. Another statement is that of Paul when he says: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us."[2] The following quotations from the book of Hebrews make this point clear: (Christ) "entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption."[3] "But now once at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."[4] "By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."[5] "But he (Christ) when he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God."[6] "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."[7] In Revelation we find this language: "Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood."[8]

Other passages could be given but these are sufficient to show that the New Testament teaches that our salvation depended on something that Christ did for us. Christ saves, and he saves by virtue of something that he accomplished. Our redemption was his achievement.

[1]Mark 10: 45. [2]Gal. 3: 13. [3]Heb. 9: 12. [4]9: 26. [5]10: 10. [6]10: 12. [7]10: 14. [8]1: 5.

He did something that makes possible for us a new relationship to God.

(2) Another thing that comes out in the passages quoted above and in many others, is that it was the death of Christ that constituted his redemptive act. It is significant that from the time of the great confession at Cæsarea Philippi Jesus laid great emphasis in teaching his disciples on his approaching death.[1] Up to that time Jesus had been waiting for the disciples to recognize him as the Messiah and become firmly convinced of his Messiahship. When they announce their acceptance of him as Messiah, he turns his attention then to teaching them the kind of Messiah that he was to be, namely, a suffering Messiah. Is it an accident that so much of the space of the Gospel records is taken up with the last week of the life of Jesus, his death and resurrection? He was put to death as a malefactor, crucified between two robbers. But this death of shame and ignominy is the thing that the evangelists put the emphasis on as the climax of a life of glorious service to God and man. This was the goal toward which his whole life moved.

This was true in the thought of Jesus. He deliberately moved toward the cross as the place where his mission of redemption should be brought to consummation. Some would have us believe that Jesus did not see the cross until well on in his ministry. He came finally to see that his conflict with the Jewish leaders would lead to death. He then, we are told, had to revise his whole attitude toward his mission, his conception of the kingdom and how the kingdom would be brought in. But it is doubtful if Jesus revised his ideas so much as some of the critics have theirs, and certainly not so much as some of them need to. Jesus knew from the first of his public ministry that he would die. In his baptism, he was no doubt devoting himself to

[1]See Matt. 16: 21; 20: 17-19; Mark 8: 31; 9: 31; 10: 33, etc.

death for the salvation of the world.[1] The temptation to obtain his kingdom by worshiping Satan gets its point from this fact. The devil was inviting him to turn aside from the long, tortuous way of suffering and death and take a shorter and easier way. This temptation to turn aside from the cross was with Jesus through his life and came to its climax in the Garden of Gethsemane.[2] With his dying breath, Jesus said: "It is finished."[3] Possibly he meant that his redemptive work in the aspect of suffering and death was now accomplished.

There are two sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels where Jesus not only speaks of his death, but also brings out the redemptive significance of death. One of these is where he speaks of giving his life a ransom for many.[4] The other is at the institution of the supper where he speaks of his blood as shed for many unto or for the remission of sins.[5] These two passages condition our salvation upon his death.

In the Gospel of John, there are some definite statements on this point. One is the saying of John the Baptist concerning Jesus as the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world.[6] No matter what passage of the Old Testament suggested this phrase to John's mind, he is evidently thinking of Jesus as one who should be a sacrifice and thereby remove the world's sin. The saying in John 3: 14, 15, that the Son of man must be lifted up, even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, seems to make our obtaining eternal life dependent on the lifting up of the Son of man. This seems to be the idea also in the discourse on the bread of life in John 6. The bread which Jesus gives is his flesh, for the life of the world (verse 51). We must eat his flesh and drink his blood to have life in ourselves

[1]See Denney, "Death of Jesus."
[2]John 6: 15; Matt. 26: 36ff.
[3]John 19: 30.
[4]Mark 10: 45.
[5]Matt. 26: 28.
[6]1: 29.

(verse 53ff). In John 10 Jesus sets himself forth as the good shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep (verses 14-17).

One of the constituent elements in the gospel, according to Paul, was that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.[1] Paul was determined to know nothing among the Corinthians but Jesus Christ and him crucified.[2] While the word of the cross was to the Jews a stumblingblock and to the Greeks foolishness, to the called it was the power of God and the wisdom of God.[3] Christ was made sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in him.[4] It was by becoming a curse for us in being hanged on a tree that Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law.[5] Paul glories in nothing but the cross. It is the power by which he is crucified to the world and the world to him.[6] God sets Christ forth in his blood as a propitiation, that God might be just and the justifier of him that has faith in Jesus.[7] We are justified in his blood.[8] We are reconciled to God through the death of his Son.[9] We have our redemption through his blood.[10] Peter says that we are redeemed from our vain manner of life with the precious blood of Christ.[11] Christ bore our sins in his body upon the tree and by his stripes we are healed.[12] In the book of Hebrews, we are told that the new covenant of grace could not be effected except upon condition of the death of the Mediator of that covenant.[13] Through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all we are sanctified.[14] By this one offering he has forever perfected those who are sanctified.[15] This sacrifice was not something needing to be repeated as did the sacrifices of the

[1]1 Cor. 15: 3.
[2]1 Cor. 2: 2.
[3]1 Cor. 1: 18, 23, 24.
[4]2 Cor. 5: 21.
[5]Gal. 3: 13.
[6]Gal. 6: 14.
[7]Rom. 3: 21-26.
[8]Rom. 5: 9.
[9]Rom. 5: 10.
[10]Eph. 1: 7.
[11]1 Peter 1: 18, 19.
[12]1 Peter 2: 24, 25.
[13]9: 15ff.
[14]10: 10.
[15]10: 14.

Levitical system. He made a complete offering once for all and thus obtained eternal redemption for us.[1]

John says that Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.[2] In the book of Revelation, we are told that he loosed us from our sins in his blood.[3] He purchased unto God with his blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation.[4] God's people overcame the accuser because of the blood of the Lamb.[5]

Further citations from the New Testament are unnecessary. These put it beyond question that it is in the blood of Christ that our salvation is found. The cross was his great redemptive deed. By his death he brings us eternal life.

(3) We are not to understand, however, that the death of Christ in its saving significance is to be separated from his life. It is true that it was the death of Christ that made atonement for our sins. But there are two things to remember about this death in relation to his life.

(a) One is that it was the sinless one that died for our sins. Him who knew no sin God made to be sin for us.[6] He died the just for the unjust.[7] If we are to regard death as the judgment of God upon sin, then his death was not a judgment upon his own sin, for he had no sin. But he was so vitally related to us that his death was God's judgment on our sin.

(b) Another thing to remember is that, if we look at the life of Christ in relation to his preincarnate glory, then his whole life on earth was a life of self-sacrifice. He became poor for our sakes that we through his poverty might be rich.[8] Paul in Phil. 2: 5ff shows that the death of the cross was the climax of a previous life of self-emptying. His very existence on earth involved

[1] 9: 14; 10: 1ff.
[2] 1 John 2: 2.
[3] 1: 5.
[4] 5: 9.
[5] 12: 11.
[6] 2 Cor. 5: 21.
[7] 1 Peter 3: 18.
[8] 2 Cor. 8: 9.

limitation and self-sacrifice. His life and his death were all of one piece, so far as moral quality is concerned.

(4) Again, we should remember that the death of Christ as a saving act is not to be separated from the resurrection. The two together constitute one redemptive achievement. They are frequently put together as two aspects of one transaction. Paul says that Christ was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification.[1] Jesus says that he lays down his life and that he takes it again.[2] It has sometimes been said that the resurrection was God's seal of approval on Christ's atoning work. That much at least is true. We are not to think, however, of the resurrection as something outside of and beyond Christ's saving work, something added to it as a kind of seal of approval only. The resurrection was an integral part of that work. It was Christ's victory over death. He could not be holden of death.[3] He came to a final and supreme struggle with death on the cross. In that struggle he conquered death. He drank the cup of death to its bitter dregs. He exhausted its power. The resurrection inevitably followed. When we think, therefore, of the death of Christ in its saving significance, we must not leave out the resurrection, but should think of the death and resurrection as parts of one saving transaction on our behalf.

(5) Paul tells us that the death of Christ for our sins was "according to the Scriptures."[4] Jesus is regarded by all the New Testament writers as fulfilling the Old Testament sacrificial offerings. John the Baptist speaks of him as the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."[5] It is generally considered that John had in mind here the suffering servant of Isa. 53. But whether he did or whether he had in mind some other Old Testament figure, the meaning is the same. He regarded

[1]Rom. 4: 25. [2]John 10: 18. [3]Acts 2: 24. [4]1 Cor. 15: 3. [5]John 1: 29.

Jesus as the one in whom the sacrificial lamb of the Old Testament found its significance.

The book of Hebrews in particular emphasizes the sacrificial work of Jesus as fulfilling the Old Testament ideal of sacrifice. The writer dwells upon the superiority of Jesus as priest and also as sacrifice. The Old Testament sacrifices were intended to remove the consciousness of sin, but this they could not do effectively. Hence they had to be repeated. But Jesus offered a sacrifice once for all that completely satisfied the conscience and perfected the worshiper. Hence no repetition of the sacrifice was necessary.[1]

2. The motive of the atonement. The motive of the atonement is the love of God. God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son.[2] God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.[3] Christ did not die to win for men the love of God but as an expression of that love. It is a travesty on the New Testament view of this doctrine to represent it as meaning that God was the embodiment of justice and Christ the embodiment of love and that Christ died to win for man the love of God. The love of Christ for sinners was the love of God. The death of Christ was the love of God in action, seeking to redeem men from sin; it was love going to the limit of suffering and agony to redeem the lost from the ruin of their own sin. The cross of Christ is the pledge of God's love for a sinful and ruined race. As such the cross represents an act of grace. It stands for God's gracious love going out to redeem man as sinful and unworthy.

3. The atonement and a holy God. We come now to consider the phase of the subject where most difficulty and difference of opinion arise. We have seen that the cross expresses the love of God and that it was a saving

[1]Heb. 9: 11-15; 10: 1ff.
[2]John 3: 16.
[3]Rom. 5: 8.

accomplishment on our behalf. The death of Christ saves us. But the question comes: How does that death save us? We have seen that it was an objective transaction on which our salvation depended. But what made this death a saving act? What gives it its saving power and significance? While the New Testament writers do not answer this question so clearly as they do some just considered, we believe they throw considerable light on it.

(1) The moral difficulty created by sin. It will help us to answer this question if we get clearly in mind the fact that there was a moral difficulty in God's relation to human sin which it was the purpose of the atonement to remove. Paul expresses it by saying that God's wrath was revealed against sin.[1] This wrath of God against sin expresses itself in the condemnation of sin. This condemnation is the thing that necessitates justification, and the ground of justification is Christ's propitiatory work.[2] This propitiatory work of Christ makes it possible that God should be just or righteous and the justifier of the one that believes in Jesus. Paul's thought, then, seems to be that the wrath of God condemns man, while the propitiatory work of Christ removes the wrath of God. This wrath of God is the righteous condemnation of man's sin, while the death of Jesus so meets the demands of God's righteousness that the moral difficulty on God's part is removed, and hence God can, upon condition of faith, justify the sinner. The implication is that without the atoning death of Christ God could not be righteous and justify the sinner.

(2) How Christ's death meets the difficulty. So far as it is possible to get at the matter as to how Christ's death saves us we might sum it up in the following statements:

[1]Rom. 1: 18. [2]Rom. 3: 19-26.

a. His death was on behalf of sinners. Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.[1] We have seen that in his death he did something that makes possible our salvation. The good Shepherd gives his life for the sheep.[2] He was lifted upon the cross that we might have eternal life.[3] As the Lamb of God, he bears the sin of the world.[4] In his blood we have our redemption, the forgiveness of sins.[5] In his blood we are loosed from our sins.[6]

b. He saved us from sin by bearing the curse of sin, by enduring the wrath of God against sin. There was something that in the garden of Gethsemane made Jesus shrink in awful agony from the coming cross. His soul was exceedingly sorrowful even unto death.[7] What was it from which Jesus was shrinking? Perhaps we get a glimpse at the meaning of it in his cry on the cross that he was forsaken of God.[8] In that dark and awful hour it seemed that the Father's face was hidden from him and he was left alone. Shall we interpret this to mean that Jesus was crying out in despair because the Father had left him in the hands of sinners to die in agony and shame? Was this all that was meant by his cry? Let us tread reverently here, for we are on holy ground. But does it not mean that in this hour Jesus is actually bearing the holy displeasure of God against a sinful race with whom Jesus has identified himself for their salvation?

In Romans we see that Christ removes the condemnation of God's wrath by means of his blood and thus justifies the sinner. In other places we see possibly a little more clearly how this was. He was made to be sin for us in order that we might become the righteousness of God in him.[9] He redeemed us from the curse of the

[1]1 Cor. 15: 3.
[2]John 10: 11, 18.
[3]John 3: 14, 15.
[4]John 1: 29.
[5]Eph. 1: 7.
[6]Rev. 1: 5.
[7]Matt. 26: 38.
[8]Matt. 27: 46.
[9]2 Cor. 5: 21.

law by being made a curse for us.[1] What was the curse of the law? Dr. Burton says that it was the law itself; that is, that Christ by his death delivered us from the law as a legalistic system, which was a curse.[2] Dr. Burton makes it still more definite as to what is meant by the curse of the law. That curse was the curse of conceiving God after a legalistic fashion as one who holds men to strict account for their sins. To be redeemed from the curse of the law means to come to a better understanding of God and realize that the law as a legalistic system misrepresents God. He says: "From this it follows further that redemption from the curse of the law is not forgiveness of sins, but deliverance of the mind from a misconception of God's attitude toward men." That is, to put it in plain words, the law in holding that God holds men to a strict account for their sins misrepresents God, and we are redeemed from the curse of the law when we come to understand that this conception of God in relation to sin is not true. Jesus too, then, must have misconceived God when he tells of how strict an account men must give. He says that one who says to his brother, "Thou fool," shall be in danger of the hell of fire.[3]

Paul does hold that Christ delivered us from the law as a legalistic system. But it is almost certain that this is not what he means here by the curse of the law. The curse was the curse which the law pronounced upon one in hanging on a tree. It was the curse of death. That curse came on us because of our sin. The law pronounced that curse of death upon us because of our failure to live up to its requirements.[4] Christ redeemed us from that curse by taking the curse of death upon himself. Thus he redeemed us from the curse.

[1]Gal. 3: 13.
[2]See "Atonement," by Burton, Smith and Smith, p. 182ff.
[3]Matt. 5: 22.
[4]Gal. 3: 10-12.

c. The death of Christ, then, was propitiatory. To propitiate means to render favorable. Christ did not render God favorable, but he so dealt with human sin as to make it possible for God to show his favor in salvation. His death was propitiatory in the sense that in his death Christ endured the righteous judgment of God upon man's sin. Paul says that God set him forth as propitiatory in his blood.[1] John says that he is the propitiation, not only for our sins, but for the sins of the whole world.[2] The book of Hebrews says that as a faithful high priest he makes propitiation for the sins of the people.[3] It is objected to this that the idea of a God who has to be propitiated before he will have mercy is a heathen idea of God. The objection is only partly true. The Christian idea is not that God has to be propitiated before he will have mercy or love the sinner, but it is rather that God's holy character reacts against sin and that sin interposes a barrier between God and the sinner so that God can not be consistent with his own moral character and save the sinner until the barrier is removed. God's righteous wrath against sin must be satisfied before God's mercy can go out to the sinner. God is not vindictive, but he does have regard to his own moral consistency. The propitiatory work of Christ is the revelation and expression of God's love.

The blood of Christ expiates the guilt of sin. In relation to God as holy the work of Christ is a propitiation; in relation to the guilt of sin it is an expiation. The guilty conscience is made clean in the blood of Jesus.[4]

d. The death of Christ was a vicarious work. It was substitutionary. He did something for us which we could not do for ourselves.

Jesus said that he came to give his life a ransom for (*anti*, instead of) many.[5] The preposition used here de-

[1]Rom. 3: 25.
[2]1 John 2: 2.
[3]Heb. 2: 17.
[4]Heb. 9: 14; 10: 22.
[5]Matt. 20: 28; Mark 10: 45.

notes substitution. Usually the prepositions used do not within themselves denote substitution (*peri* and *huper*). It is said that he dies for, or on behalf of, sinners. But this does not exclude the idea of substitution. A thing may be done for, or on behalf of, one by being done in his place or stead. So when it is said that Christ dies for our sins,[1] or on behalf of us,[2] this may be done in the way of substitution (*huper; peri* would have about the same meaning). But when it is said that he gave his life a ransom in the stead or place of (*anti*) many, it can hardly be anything but substitution.

Consider again Paul's statement that Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for us. The explanation of this passage given above shows that it can not mean anything except that he redeemed us from the curse of death pronounced upon us by the law and that he did this by taking that curse upon himself.

The matter can be simply stated as follows: On account of our sin the sentence of death came upon us. Jesus had no sin. Yet death came to him. It came on account of our sin and on behalf of us. He took upon himself the sentence of death that was due to us. By bearing that sentence he sets us free. This is what is meant when it is said that we are redeemed with the blood of Jesus.[3] The blood stands for the life which he freely gave up for us.

(3) An objection considered. But it is objected that it would not be just, but rather the height of injustice, for one man to bear the sins of other men. It is not just, it is urged, for one man to be punished for another man's wrongdoing. If God should put the sins of the guilty on the innocent, that would show him to be a monster instead of a God of love.

In reply to this objection let us consider the following facts:

[1]1Cor. 15: 3. [2]Rom. 5: 8. [3]1 Peter 1: 19.

a. It is a law of life that men should suffer for the wrongs of others. No matter what we may say about the justice or injustice of it, it is a fact. And it is difficult to see how it could be otherwise in a social world. An arrangement by which one would suffer the exact deserts of his sins and nobody else suffer for them would hardly be a social world at all. And it is true that the innocent suffer for the guilty. Instances are too numerous to need mention. This is one of the great disciplinary laws of life. Men are often restrained from evil by the consciousness that others will suffer if they sin. Also, it is true that much of our moral development comes from suffering on behalf of others. It is a law of the Christian life that one should be willing to follow the Savior's example in doing this.

b. The highest expression of love is found in this Christian law of willingness to suffer on behalf of others. This was the crowning glory of the life of Christ and is the thing that marks a man as a follower of Christ. If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.[1] It is love that moves one to share the sufferings of others. It was love that moved Christ to give himself for us. If it is held that one could not bear the sins of another, that would be equivalent to saying that love in that respect was limited. That is to say, in the very realm where one most needs help, in the moral and spiritual, the realm of our sins and failures, love is impotent to render service.

c. Besides, this objection is based on a false assumption. The objection says that it would be unjust for God to lay the sins of one man on another man. But there are two things to be said in answer to this. One is that God did not take our sins and lay them on an unwilling victim. Christ took our sins on himself. As a matter of love, he voluntarily assumed our obligation. He laid down his life of himself.[2]

[1]Rom. 8: 9. [2]John 10: 18.

d. Again, the objection assumes that Christ is only one human individual among other human individuals. Perhaps the objector would be right in saying that one human individual could not bear the sins of countless other human individuals. The relation of Christ to any man or to the race as a whole is entirely different from the relation of one who is only a human individual to his fellowmen or to the race. The race exists in Christ. It was in and through him that the race was created and is preserved.[1] He is, therefore, the author of the whole moral order that has been violated by man's sin. In his case, then, it is not true that the author of the moral law takes the sin of one who has violated that law and lays it on another subject of the law. Rather is it the case that the author of the moral law took upon himself the burden of our sins. It is true that Jesus as a man was subject to the moral law. Otherwise he could not have assumed its obligations. But he is more than a subject of the law. As the eternal Son of God, he is the author of the moral law. He is the source of the moral order under which man lives. If the author of the moral law wishes to assume its obligations, that would be a different matter from his laying those obligations on a helpless subject of the law.

To put it another way, the doctrine of the atonement does not mean that God laid the burden of our sins on a helpless human individual, but rather that in the person of Christ God himself got under the burden of our sins to save us. The work of Christ is the work of God.

4. Faith and atonement. Our faith in Jesus throws light on the atonement. We trust him as Savior from sin. We come to him confessing ourselves morally and spiritually bankrupt. We recognize that we have no standing of our own before a holy God. For such standing we must trust ourselves into his hands. We ac-

[1]John 1: 3; Col. 1: 16, 17.

knowledge ourselves dependent on him in the most important of all realms, the moral and spiritual; and in the most fundamental of all relations, our relation with God. We confess ourselves disqualified to deal with God as holy in our own name; our sins have disqualified us. Christ is qualified to deal with God for us. And the New Testament makes it clear that the thing that qualifies him to deal with God on our behalf is his death for us. This sets his death as the ground of our acceptance with God over against our sins as the ground of our rejection. Our sins constitute our moral disqualification; his death constitutes the basis of our moral standing before God.

III. **False or inadequate theories of the atonement.** The trouble with most theories of the atonement is that they have been run in too narrow a mold. It is doubtful if any theory ever formulated does not fail to do justice to the facts in some important respects, even if it is not positively erroneous. The atonement was a great moral and spiritual transaction. It took place in the moral and spiritual realm. Like all realities of the spiritual realm, we are almost, if not entirely, dependent on analogies that belong to the spatial and temporal order to state the meaning of this great fact. An analogy brings out the likeness between the spiritual fact and the one to which it is likened. So we have many figures in the New Testament to set forth the meaning of the death of Christ in relation to our salvation. In this way one phase at a time of the atonement is set forth. And in constructing theories of the atonement men have usually taken one of these analogies and tried to explain the total significance of the atonement in terms of that analogy. In this way one phase of the matter is brought into prominence while other vital phases fall into the background. This results in such an overemphasis on one aspect of the matter to the neglect of others that a posi-

tive heresy is the result. This is especially the case when the aspect emphasized brings out only a subordinate phase of the truth rather than a fundamental aspect of it.

Let us consider now some of the theories of the atonement that have made the mistake just spoken of.

1. One is the example theory. This theory holds that Christ did not suffer vicariously, that he did not propitiate God, nor expiate the guilt of sin. Christ was only a man, a great religious teacher and genius. He died as a result of fidelity to truth and duty. He gave up his life rather than yield what he conceived to be his duty to God and man. We are saved, if we should use that term at all, by following his example. He was the first Christian. He was *primus inter pares*. He was not different in kind from us. He was the subject but not the object of faith. We do not trust in him for salvation; we have faith in God after his example, as he went even to death trusting God to take care of him. What we need is not some one to expiate the guilt of sin, for there is no such guilt. What we need is an inspiring example to stimulate us to be true to the highest and best we know. That is what Jesus does for us. It is in this sense, and this sense only, that he saves us.

Whatever else may be said of this theory, it is not the Christian view with reference to Jesus and his saving work for us. Jesus is our example. We are exhorted to suffer after his example.[1] His spirit in this respect should be ours. We are to deny ourselves and take up the cross.[2] But this does not state the full view with reference to Jesus and his atoning work. We are not only to follow his example. We are to trust him as Savior. We are to obey him as Lord. He made demands upon men that would have been absurd if he were not the object of faith as well as the subject.[3]

[1] 1 Peter 2: 19ff. [2] Matt. 16: 24. [3] E.g., Luke 14: 33.

The objection is sometimes made that we could not imitate the sufferings of Christ if his sufferings were vicarious. It is urged that since the New Testament view is that we should follow his example in suffering, therefore, his sufferings are not regarded as vicarious by the New Testament writers.[1] The argument is that, if we are to imitate his sufferings, then there could be nothing in his sufferings of a nature different from our sufferings. We can suffer sympathetically for others, but we can not suffer so as to expiate the guilt of sin. So, it is urged, that Christ did not suffer so as to expiate the guilt of sin.

But the fact that we may imitate the sufferings of Christ in certain respects does not prove that his sufferings are in no respects unlike ours. The fact that Peter holds up the sufferings of Christ as in some respects to be imitated by Christians does not prove that there may not be some things in the sufferings of Christ that can not be imitated by us. Those who raise this objection to the substitutionary view of the atonement say that when Peter says that Christ died the just for the unjust,[2] he does not mean that Christ suffered for our sins in a sense that one man can not suffer for the sins of another, else Peter could not urge us to suffer after the example of Christ.[3] Those who take this position, to be consistent, would say, and doubtless many of them would say, that Jesus could not be the Son of God in a peculiar sense and at the same time be imitable by us. But as a matter of fact our ideal does not need to be altogether in a class with us. The sinless Son of God is a better ideal for us than a sinless man would be. Our ideal should be one that towers constantly above us, one that we never reach but which ever challenges us to higher endeavor. If our example must be altogether like us,

[1] See "Atonement," by Burton Smith and Smith, pp. 210-212.

[2] 1 Peter 3: 18.

[3] 1 Peter 2: 19ff; 3: 14ff.

then he should not only be human but a sinner. So our example after all would be no example, he would be no better than ourselves. This argument certainly would prevent us from taking the character of God as our ideal, but this is exactly what Jesus enjoins upon us to do.[1] We are to imitate the example of Jesus in his sufferings. We are to bear the cross. The cross is to be the moral dynamic of our lives. As he loved, so are we to love. But the cross can not be imitated by us, we can not love after the example of Jesus, unless the cross is more than an example for us, unless it is a redemptive power that delivers us from the bondage of sin. As long as I in my moral consciousness am enslaved by the sense of guilt and condemnation, how can I follow the example of the sinless Christ in his life of love and sacrificial death? The cross can not be my example unless it is first my redemption. To be my example it must be more. This is true for the simple reason that I am a sinner while Jesus was not a sinner. I must be made different from what I am by nature before I can imitate Jesus, because he is so different from me.

2. The moral influence view of the atonement. This view is sometimes spoken of simply as the moral view of the atonement. There is no hard and fast line of demarcation between this and the example theory. This theory, however, goes further, at least when set out in characteristic form, than the example theory. Those who hold this theory would not necessarily deny the deity of Christ. In fact, the theory in its fulness calls for a belief in his deity. It would also hold to regeneration by faith in Christ as Savior. It does not look upon Christ's saving work as being simply the moral influence of a good example.

This theory denies that Christ's death was substitutionary. There was nothing of the nature of penalty in

[1]Matt. 5: 48.

his sufferings. There is nothing in the way of wrath in God to be satisfied before God can forgive sin. Christ's death, therefore, did not expiate the guilt of sin. Christ died not as a revelation of the wrath of God against sin, but as a revelation of love for the sinner. The only difficulty in the way of the sinner's salvation is on the sinner's part, not on God's. If the sinner will only repent, God stands ready to forgive. The purpose of the death of Christ is to manifest the love of God and thus lead the sinner to repent.

It will be seen that this view repudiates everything in the way of a judicial or forensic view of the atonement or of salvation. It has this in common with the example theory. In common with that view, it objects to the idea that one person should die in the place of another. One may suffer sympathetically with and for another, but one could not suffer in the place of another, so that the other should not need to suffer. Especially does it insist that this is true with reference to the penalty of sin. There is a strong tendency among those holding this view to make love the controlling attribute in God, to the neglect or denial of anything like retributive righteousness. Suffering is regarded as primarily, if not exclusively, remedial.

One objection to this theory is that it tends toward a psychology of religion that reduces the guilt of sin to a guilt-consciousness that has no objective ground. It says that the only difficulty in the way of the sinner's salvation is in the sinner, not in God. No propitiation of God is necessary. There is no wrath of God against sin that needs to be appeased. That amounts to saying that man's guilt consciousness is an illusion. His sense of ill desert is morbid. The kind of religious experience that we find in Bunyan, Luther, Carey or Paul is abnormal and interferes with the development of the right type of Christian character. What men need is not

salvation from guilt and condemnation, but salvation from their consciousness of guilt and condemnation. To save them from this they do not need an objective atonement that is the ground of our being set right in relation to an objective moral law that condemns or a holy God who has been offended, but they need rather to discover that there is no such condemnation and no wrath of an offended deity. The atonement is intended to assure them of this.

But if man's religious consciousness is illusive in respect to guilt and condemnation, why may it not be also with reference to God's love and mercy? Why should our religious consciousness be trustworthy in regard to one and not in regard to the other? The consciousness of guilt and condemnation has been as thoroughly embedded in the experience of Christians as the consciousness of the love of God. In fact, in experience the two go together. This is the teaching of Jesus in Luke 7: 40ff. At least it is involved in what Jesus says. He shows that one who is most conscious of sins forgiven will love most. He is speaking to Pharisees who had no sense of need of forgiveness. He says in substance: "You do not love because you have not had any sense of sins forgiven." It is only as we have a consciousness of sin and guilt that we will have such a consciousness of the grace of God in saving from sin as to call out our love to God. The love of God is not magnified, then, but minimized by minimizing the guilt and condemnation of sin. This has its bearing on practical Christian activity. The men that have had a deep sense of guilt, followed by a consciousness of salvation through the grace of God have been the great evangelists, missionaries and builders in the kingdom of God. They have been the men who have initiated new eras in the advancement of Christianity in the world.

Besides, if our consciousness as to sin and guilt is not trustworthy, then is our religious consciousness trutworthy at all? If our consciousness is illusory as to guilt and condemnation, is it not illusory as to the love of God and as to religious reality altogether? If there is no objective condemnation for sin, is there any objective love of God or even any God at all?

Of course, the objector may hold that our contention here is not valid on the ground that this distinct consciousness of sin and condemnation does not come to all. Some never have a distinct sense of sin as guilt. Hence the objector says that to hold that there is universal condemnation on the ground that some have had a feeling of condemnation is not valid reasoning. Our reply is that sin is a universal phenomenon and that the sense of condemnation for sin is too distinct and clear to be explained as illusory. Neither is the consciousness of the love of God universal. This consciousness of condemnation is too vitally related to the consciousness of the love of God to explain the former as subjective and illusory while holding that the latter is true to reality. It is easier to explain the experience of those who do not have a distinct consciousness of guilt as due to a lack of spiritual perception on their part than to explain the consciousness of guilt on the part of those who do have it as being merely subjective and illusory. We hold that the sense of guilt is so vital a factor in the Christian consciousness that to reduce that sense of guilt to illusion means to invalidate the Christian consciousness altogether and land us in religious agnosticism. If men have not known God in the Christian experience of salvation, they have never known him anywhere; and the sense of guilt is an essential factor in the Christian experience of salvation. If redemption by the death of Jesus Christ means redemption from our false notion that God is a God of wrath rather than

redemption from objective condemnation due to the reaction of a holy God toward sin as ill deserving, then Mrs. Eddy is right with reference to sin and salvation, and Jesus and Paul were wrong. Both can not be right.

Another objection to the moral influence theory of the atonement is that it furnishes no rational connection between the death of Christ and the end to be accomplished by it. The vicarious or substitutionary view does furnish a clear explanation of the connection between the two. The end to be accomplished according to the substitutionary view is our deliverance from the condemnation that comes upon us because of our sin. Christ accomplishes that end by taking on himself the curse due to our sin. He died in our place. According to the moral influence theory, the end to be accomplished is such a revelation of the love of God as will turn sinners from their sins. But the question arises: How is the death of Christ a manifestation of the love of God? What is the connection between his death and our sin that makes his death a manifestation of God's love to us? The vicarious view answers this question by saying that Christ's death was the bearing of our curse; it was such a manifestation of the wrath of God against sin as to make it possible that God could be righteous and yet justify the penitent sinner. The moral influence theory has no answer to the question. In other words, this theory can show nothing in the moral connections to necessitate the death of Christ as the ground of our salvation. The illustrations of Dr. Denney[1] and of Dr. Mullins[2] are in point. If a father should plunge himself into the water and drown himself, or thrust his hand into the fire and burn it off, this would not be a manifestation of love to the father's child unless the father incurred the loss to save the child from danger of drowning in the one case or of burning in the other. It

[1] "Death of Jesus." [2] "The Christian Religion," etc.

would rather be a manifestation of folly. So unless the sinner rests under a condemnation that endangers his spiritual welfare, how is the death of Christ a manifestation of the love of God to the sinner?

A third objection to the moral influence theory is that it is not true to the New Testament teaching on this subject. We have already dealt with the teaching of the New Testament and tried to show that it teaches that man is under condemnation because of the guilt of sin and that Christ saves us from this condemnation by taking on himself our condemnation. The opposers of the vicarious view of the atonement, including the advocates of the moral influence theory, try to avoid the force of this teaching in one of two ways—either by setting aside the teaching of the New Testament as not authoritative for us, or by denying that the writers of the New Testament teach the vicarious view. The greatest difficulty they have is with Paul. Some hold that Paul perverted original Christianity. Jesus, so they tell us, taught nothing like the penal view of sin or the vicarious view of the atonement. This came from Paul and was due mostly to his Pharisaic training and consequent legalistic methods of thought. But as a matter of fact Jesus himself did hold to an objective atonement for sin. His blood was shed for the remission of sins.[1] He gave his life as a ransom instead of many.[2] So teach all the New Testament writers, as previously pointed out.

Those who try to explain away the substitutionary view in Paul have a difficult task. We have already referred to Dr. Burton's explanation of Gal. 3: 13. He denies that the curse from which Christ redeems us is the curse of condemnation pronounced upon us by the law. He says that it is the law itself as a legalistic system; and further explains this to mean that we are re-

[1]Matt. 26: 28. [2]Mark 10: 45.

deemed from the curse in the sense that we come to understand that God is not a legalist in the sense that he keeps books with men in regard to their sins. We come rather to understand that he is a God of love. In other words, he says it is atonement by revelation.[1] Christ atones for our sins by revealing the character of God as love and thus our fear of God is removed. With all due deference to this great New Testament scholar, we are bound to say that we think he has the matter backward. It is not atonement by revelation, but revelation by atonement. That is, Christ did not atone for sin simply by revealing the love of God, but he reveals the love of God by a deed of redemption in which he bore the curse of our condemnation for sin.

The context indicates that the curse from which Christ redeems us[2] is the curse of death. Paul says that the blessing of the gospel is life and it comes by faith (vs. 11). Men could have life under the law if they did the things demanded by the law (vs. 12). But a curse comes on those who do not do all the things commanded in the law (vs. 10). Since the blessing of the gospel is life, it is almost certain that the curse that Paul had in mind in vs. 10 is the curse of death that the law pronounces on those who violate its commands. This is the curse Christ took on himself. This is the curse from which Christ redeemed us. Paul's statement in 2 Cor. 5: 19 that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself means not simply the removal of man's enmity toward God but rather the non-imputation of sin. This is true, for Paul defines the reconciliation as including, if not being identical with, the fact that God was "not reckoning unto them their trespasses." Does this not define for us the sense in which we are made "to become the righteousness of God in Christ," and the sense in which God made Christ to be

[1]"Atonement," pp. 189, 191. [2]Gal. 3: 13.

"sin for us"? If so, then Christ was made to be sin for us in the sense that our sins were reckoned to him. Consequently it was made possible that they should not be reckoned to us.

3. The governmental theory. The governmental theory of the atonement holds that the primary need tor the atonement was not to be found in the reaction of God's holy nature against sin, but rather in the exigencies of God's moral government. It says that for God to forgive sin without in some way manifesting his displeasure toward sin would be to encourage his rational and moral creatures to live in sin. Therefore in order to guarantee that God's forgiveness of sins would not encourage men to live in sin he visited his displeasure upon sin before forgiving man. Christ suffered, not the penalty of sin, but what God accepted as a substitute for penalty on man's part.

There is a serious objection to this theory besides the Scripture teaching already set forth, that Christ suffered the curse of our sins in our stead.

It makes the moral law with its sanctions a matter of arbitrary appointment on God's part, to be enforced or relaxed according as exigencies may demand or God may will. According to this view mercy means the relaxing of the demands of justice, at least in part. But this is the Mohammedan rather than the Christian conception of mercy. The Christian doctrine of the atonement means that the high requirements of the moral law are not relaxed in order to save man, but that in his great love for men who had not met those requirements the Son of God assumed their moral liabilities and paid their debt. Moral law is not a matter of arbitrary enactment to be relaxed at will, but it expresses the moral nature of God and is as unchangeable in its principles and demands as the moral nature of the God it expresses. Therefore God himself can not relax the

demands of the moral law without ceasing to be God. But as a matter of grace he can get under the burden of man's sin and bear the burden in order that man may be saved. In the atonement he did that.

It is true that in the atonement the exigencies of God's moral government are taken care of. The atonement does guarantee that sins are forgiven on such principles as not to encourage men to live in sin. But this is due partly to the fact that the atonement reveals to us as nothing else does the unchangeableness of the high demands of God's moral law.

4. The commercial theory.[1] The commercial theory tries to interpret the atonement exclusively in terms of a commercial transaction. It emphasizes those passages in the New Testament where sin is spoken of as a debt and those where Christ's work is spoken of as a ransom to deliver us from sin and death. It emphasizes the idea of redemption as a buying back by the payment of a price. It will be seen that the theory is strictly substitutionary. It sometimes goes so far as to emphasize the quantitative aspect of Christ's sufferings and hold that Christ suffered the exact amount of suffering that was due the elect on account of their sins. The atonement, therefore, was limited. Christ did not pay the penalty for the sins of the whole world, but only for the elect.

This theory is false by way of overemphasis on one phase of the truth. It represents one extreme, of which the moral influence theory is the other. The moral influence theory has developed over against this theory

[1]What is here called the commercial theory of the atonement contains some features of Anselm's theory, but it is more like the current penal-substitutionary view. For a good criticism of the latter theory, see Dr. Mabie's discussion in his "Meaning of the Cross" and "How Does the Death of Christ Save Us?" Anselm's theory is not discussed in the text because it is only of historical interest.

and as a protest against its exaggerations. In that respect, the moral influence theory represents a healthful tendency in theology, but it has gone so far in reaction that it has become a worse heresy than the one against which it protests. The commercial theory is correct in looking at sin as a debt and the atonement of Christ as the payment of a ransom price for our disobedience. It is so represented in the New Testament.[1] But it makes the great mistake of trying to interpret the saving work of Christ altogether in terms of the payment of a debt. This set of figures represents only one phase of the transaction. As Dr. Mabie truly says, the atonement is not merely vicarious; it is vicario-vital. This theory represents the truth that the atonement is vicarious; the moral influence theory presents the truth that it is vital. We need to see both elements. No one figure or set of figures can represent all the truth about a transaction that is so fundamental and far-reaching. We have no better illustration of the fact that a heresy is the choosing of some phase of the truth and emphasizing it to the neglect or exclusion of other phases.

The atonement of Christ is not only the payment of a debt for us, the doing of something for us which we could not do for ourselves, and in that sense substitutionary; it is more than that. It is a great moral and spiritual transaction in which all the fundamental vitalities of life and its eternal verities are involved. It obtained for us a fundamentally new relationship to God and to the whole of life. It makes of the whole historical order in which we live a redemptive order. It changes the whole meaning of life. No one set of analogies can represent the whole of the truth. There is no surer road to error in theology than to take some figure or set of figures that represent some phase of truth to us and construe these figures as exclusive finalities as

[1]Matt. 6: 12; Mark 10: 45; Gal. 3: 13; Eph. 1: 7.

stating the whole of truth, and then proceed to deduce the "logical consequences" from these figures. It is by such an absurd method that men make the parable of the prodigal son to represent the whole truth of Christianity and show us with all the conclusiveness of an assured finality that no atonement is necessary to induce a God of love to receive a penitent sinner, as if we were to get a whole system of theology out of one illustration.

It is especially hazardous to try to interpret a great moral and spiritual transaction like the atonement in quantitative terms. Quantitative conceptions should not be made the governing consideration in interpreting spiritual realities. So far as a limited atonement is concerned, it is made too clear in the New Testament that Christ died for the whole world.[1] It was a transaction in which the whole race was put potentially on a new basis before God. It was a transaction that involved the whole race, just as the sin of the first man involved the ruin of the whole race. Neither the sin of the first man nor the redemptive work of the last Adam, however, is to be interpreted as involving our ruin or our salvation independently of our own moral activity. Our evil inheritance in Adam becomes our individual possession when we act out its evil propensities and voluntarily make it ours; our redemptive inheritance in Christ becomes ours when we appropriate it by faith.

5. Eternal atonement. Another view is that the cross of Christ represents or reveals the eternal suffering of God on account of man's sin and that this eternal suffering of God constitutes the atonement. A good many recent writers have given statements that look in the direction of this view, but no one has given more definite formulation of it than Dr. A. H. Strong.[2] In his

[1] John 3: 16; 1 John 2: 2.

[2] See "Sys. Theol.," section on the atonement. Cf. H. C. Mabie in works above referred to.

case it was the result of his view of the relation of Christ to humanity in what he called Ethical Monism. With Ethical Monism as such, we are not here concerned. With the theory of the atonement as consisting in the eternal sufferings of God, we are concerned.

It may be true that God suffers on account of the sins and woes of mankind. It is difficult to see how it could be otherwise. And this theory of the atonement represents a healthful reaction against the philosophy that regarded God as impassive and, therefore, represented him as sitting off in cold indifference while men suffer and die. A man filled with the Spirit of God suffers over the sins and woes of his fellowmen. Is not this an indication that God also suffers because of men and with them? Is not the yearning of the Christian man for the salvation of others a faint reflection of the passion of God for their redemption?

Again, this theory comes nearer the truth than a view that would allow God the Father to sit in indifference while Christ the Son died for the sins of men. There must have been suffering on the part of the Father as well as on the part of the Son. But this is different from saying that the non-temporal sufferings of God constitute the atonement and that the cross was only a manifestation of this.

One objection to this view is that it tends toward, if it is not inseparably connected with, an idealistic philosophy that regards the historical as unreal. The real is the super-temporal, the eternal. The temporal and historical are only faint reflections of the super-temporal. But Christianity is historical. The historical is the real. Even if this form of idealism were not objectionable from the Christian point of view, it is at least questionable if the interpretation of the cross of Christ should be made dependent on the acceptance of a particular form of idealism.

The New Testament does not seem to favor this view. In favor of the view such passages as that Christ was a lamb slain from the foundation of the world are quoted. But this clearly means that he stood thus in the mind and purpose of God. The realization of this purpose came in the cross of Christ. The New Testament favors the view that the incarnation was in order to make atonement rather than that it was to reveal the atonement. The book of Hebrews especially emphasizes the idea that the sacrificial work of Christ was something done once for all. It was complete in one supreme redemptive act.[1] The cross of Christ reveals God's eternal love for sinners and his eternal purpose to save them, but this purpose came to historical realization in the cross of Christ. The cross was the achievement of redemption in pursuance of God's eternal purpose.

IV. **The intercession of Christ.** We have in the Gospel records at least two clear instances of Christ's intercession for his disciples while he was on earth. One is his statement to Simon: "I have made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not."[2] Satan was to sift the apostles, he was to put them through a testing that would try their faith to the limit; but Jesus made supplication for Peter individually to the end that his faith should endure the testing. The other is the intercession for those who had believed on him and those who should believe on him, as recorded in John 17. He prays that they may be kept, sanctified and made one.

There are several references in the New Testament to the intercession of Jesus on behalf of his people after his ascension. As High Priest he offers his blood as atonement for sin and makes intercession for the people.

[1]See 9: 12; 10: 10-12. [2]Luke 22: 32.

1. It appears from the book of Hebrews that his work of intercession is based on his sacrificial work. After making atonement by the sacrifice of himself he appears in heaven before the face of God for us.[1]

2. Whatever else these passages mean, they assure us that the living Christ, on the basis of his sacrificial work, is still active on our behalf. A dead Christ can not save. It is the living Christ who breaks the power of sin and delivers us from the law of sin and death. Because he lives we shall live also.[2] Having reconciled us to God through his death, he now saves us by his life.[3] He saves to the uttermost those that come to God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.[4]

3. It is not made very clear just what blessings come to us through Christ's intercession except the general statement, above noted, that life and salvation to the uttermost are thus ours. The suggestion comes from Christ's prayer for Peter and for believers in John 17 that our being kept through faith is the result of his intercession. The believer's assurance when he sins is in the fact that Jesus Christ the righteous is his Advocate.[5] One is inclined to believe that somehow all our spiritual blessings, and even all blessings of whatsoever nature, come to us as a result of Christ's mediation on our behalf on the basis of his sacrifice. It is difficult to see how a holy God could bless sinful men on any other basis.

4. Our confidence, then, toward God comes from Christ's work as our great High Priest. He gives us confidence of permament standing before a holy God. Because he is our sympathetic High Priest we can come boldly to a throne of grace.[6] Because of his atoning and intercessory work we have access to God, and

[1]Heb. 9: 24.
[2]John 14: 19.
[3]Rom. 5: 10.
[4]Heb. 7: 25.
[5]1 John 2: 1.
[6]Heb. 4: 16.

can come with confidence that we shall be heard. The intercession of Christ does not mean that God is inaccessible while Christ is. It means that God in Christ is accessible and that Christ as our Intercessor guarantees our access and standing with God. It means that in Christ all the difficulties of our approach to God have been met and no barrier stands between the believer and a God reconciled in Christ. The guarantee of our right to come to God and of our standing with him is not in the atonement as an event apart from Christ's person, but it is in the Person who suffered for us and who is now active on our behalf.

CHAPTER III

BECOMING A CHRISTIAN, OR THE BEGINNING OF SALVATION

I. The conditions of salvation.
   1. Repentance.
      (1) Other terms used.
      (2) What is repentance?
         a. Conviction of sin.
         b. Contrition for sin.
         c. Renunciation of sin.
      (3) Repentance and reformation.
      (4) Christian life a life of repentance.
      (5) Repentance and conversion.
   2. Faith.
      (1) Meaning of faith.
         a. Christ the object of faith.
         b. Two aspects of faith.
            (a) Receiving Christ as Savior.
            (b) Submission to Christ as Lord.
      (2) An objection to Christian faith—that it degrades one's personality.
         Answer: By faith one realizes his true self.
      (3) Why salvation is by faith.
         a. That it might be by grace.
         b. Excludes any rite or ceremony as condition of salvation.
      (4) The relation of faith to a life of righteousness.
         a. Does not encourage sin or spiritual ease.
         b. Paul and James.
         c. Faith in Christ the only thing that can produce righteousness.

II. Union with Christ.
   1. New Testament teaches the doctrine.
   2. It is by faith.

3. We are united to the living Christ.
4. Union with Christ is union with God.
5. This union does not mean pantheism.
6. Union with Christ sums up all of salvation.

III. God's saving act.
1. In Christ we have forgiveness of sins.
(1) Scriptures setting forth forgiveness.
(2) The meaning of forgiveness.
a. Meaning of term.
b. Sinner not made as if he had not sinned.
c. Fellowship with God restored.
d. Personal act above law.
e. Consequences of sin not all immediately removed.
f. Insight into God's character.
(3) Objections to the doctrine of forgiveness.
a. That it is not consistent with unchangeableness of God.
Answer:
God's unchanageableness is the consistency of a person, not the unchangeableness of impersonal force.
b. That it encourages one to live in sin.
Answer:
(a) Forgiveness is on basis of atonement.
(b) Forgiveness is conditioned upon repentance.
2. In Christ we are justified.
(1) Doctrine defined.
(2) A one-sided statement of the doctrine.
(3) An objection to the doctrine.
(4) Roman Catholic position.
(5) Justification and regeneration.
(6) Values of the doctrine.
a. Gives assurance of acceptance once for all with a holy God.
b. Brings peace, joy and freedom.
c. Furnishes basis for true righteousness.
3. In Christ we are reconciled to God.
(1) Meaning of term.
(2) Involves change on God's part as well as man's.
4. In Christ we are adopted.
(1) Three uses of term.
(2) Relation to justification and regeneration.
5. In Christ we have life.
(1) Terms used in New Testament to set forth idea.
(2) Need of regeneration.

(3) The nature of regeneration.
a. Mysterious.
b. Moral and spiritual renewal.
c. Wrought by the Spirit of God.
d. Renewed in image of Christ.
e. The gospel the means.
f. Conditioned on faith.
g. Conscious or subconscious?

6. In Christ we are sanctified.
(1) Meaning of the term.
(2) All Christians sanctified.
a. Dedicated to Christ.
b. Purified by faith.

IV. The Consciousness of Salvation.

1. The normal Christian experience—conscious acceptance with God.
(1) Conviction of sin a conscious transaction.
(2) Salvation conscious communion with God.
2. Lack of assurance.
(1) Assurance sometimes lacking.
(2) Causes for the lack.
3. What is necessary to assurance.
(1) Clear and definite faith.
(2) Marks of a regenerated man.

It is in order now to give attention to the Christian life itself. We will look at the Christian life as a life of redemption. This is undoubtedly the chief characteristic of Christianity as we find it in the New Testament. Christianity is a religion of redemption. Man's chief need, his one need that is fundamental to all others, is his need of salvation from sin. It was to save man from sin that Christ came into the world. That was his mission.

We will consider salvation in its beginning, in its continuance and progress, and in its consummation.

I. **The conditions of salvation.** We will consider first what are usually called the conditions of salvation. By this we mean the spiritual attitude one must assume in receiving the grace of God that saves from sin. In other words, what must one do to become a Christian?

There are many terms used in the New Testament to describe the experience of becoming a Christian. Perhaps the essential elements can all be summed up in the two terms repentance and faith. It is no accident that the experience of becoming a Christian has two fundamental aspects, for in this experience man is concerned with two fundamental relations of life. One is his relation to sin; the other, his relation to God as a God of grace, revealed in Christ as Savior. The inward turning from sin is repentance; turning to Christ as Savior is faith. Each implies the other. Neither is possible without the other. At the same time and in the same act that one turns from sin he turns to Christ. Sin and Christ are the opposite poles of the moral universe and one cannot turn from one without turning to the other. Repentance and faith are not two acts or moral attitudes; they are two aspects of one act or attitude.

1. Repentance.

(1) Other terms used to describe repentance. Repentance is not the only term, by any means, used in the New Testament to describe the act or attitude denoted by that word. Jesus says: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross, and follow me."[1] To deny one's self means to renounce self as sinful and selfish; to renounce the old self as unworthy. To take up the cross is to die; to die to the old self and give one's self to a new Master, Jesus Christ. Jesus says also: "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it."[2] To lose one's life here is to give it away to another, to give it to Christ and one's fellows in service. He puts this over against saving one's life in such a way as to lose it. To save it (so as to lose it) means to keep it for one's self, to live the self-centered life. To lose it (so as to save it) is to renounce the self-centered life. Paul speaks about Christians as those

[1]Matt. 16: 24.
[2]Matt. 16: 25.
[3]Rom. 6: 2.

being crucified with Christ,[1] and about those who have crucified the flesh with the affections and the lusts thereof.[2] He glories in the cross through which the world has been crucified to him and he to the world.[3] All these are different ways of expressing the idea of repentance.

(2) What is repentance? The term that is translated repentance in the New Testament means a change of mind. This involves at least three things.

a. Either as an element in repentance or as a precedent condition, it involves the understanding of one's condition as a sinner. One must come to realize something of the guilt and condemnation of his sin. This is ordinarily spoken of as conviction of sin. Some theologians speak of it as the intellectual element in repentance. It comes as a result of hearing gospel truth and the enlightening work of the Holy Spirit. One cannot repent until he comes to see something of the nature of his sin. This does not mean that the consciousness of sin must be present in the same form and to the same extent in every case. In some cases the consciousness of sin may take the form of a sense of guilt and condemnation. In others it may be the sense of moral failure. But in every case the hearing of the gospel intensifies this consciousness of sin. In some cases at first it is nothing more than a vague uneasiness, a consciousness that somehow things are not right with us. The hearing of the gospel intensifies and clarifies this, so that it becomes a definite consciousness of sin. Sin comes to be seen as sin. This means that it comes to be seen as against God. As seen in relation to a God of holy love it comes to be seen in its true character.

b. A second thing involved in repentance is that the love of sin shall die in one's heart. This is usually spoken of as the emotional element in repentance. One may see himself ever so clearly as a sinner and even un-

[1]Gal. 2: 20. [2]Gal. 5: 24. [3]Gal. 6: 14.

derstand the ruin involved in sin, but unless the love of sin dies in his heart, it will make no difference in his life. He has not repented.

This is not to be identified with fear of punishment. One may have fear of punishment without gospel repentance. This fear of punishment may produce what has been termed "hell-scared religion." But unless there is something more in one's religion than the fear of punishment he will not escape punishment. This fear of punishment may be intensified into remorse of conscience, so that one has no rest day or night. But remorse of consciense is not repentance. That is to say, repentance is a gospel grace, not simply a state of mind, produced by a knowledge of the law, which brings a message of condemnation for sin, but no message of salvation from sin.

One may often have great emotion because of sin and yet not repent. He may freely weep, but when the emotion passes he goes back to his old sins.

The emotional element in true repentance may be described as "godly sorrow that worketh repentance."[1] It is a sorrow that grows out of a true understanding of our sin as it is related to a God of grace. It is contrition. "A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."[2] When one has this contrition on account of sin, it will lead on to the third and final element in repentance.

c. The third element is the renunciation of sin. It is the repudiation of sin by an act of will. Because the love of sin dies in one's heart, there is a revulsion of one's whole moral nature against it. Sin is repudiated, not so much because one sees that he will be punished for sin, as because one sees sin in its true nature and comes to hate it. This leads to a changed life in regard to sin. "How can we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?"[3] Such a thing is a moral impossibility. Re-

[1]2 Cor. 7: 10. [2]Ps. 51: 17. [3]Rom. 6: 2.

pentance is never complete until the will thus repudiates sin. This repudiation of sin and a contrite heart on account of sin always go together. They are two aspects of one state of mind.

This shows that the change of mind here spoken of is not simply an intellectual change. The mind includes the whole moral nature of man. To make up one's mind is not simply an act of the intellect. To repent is to think back over one's course, to see the wrongness of it, and make up one's mind to change. It is no superficial matter; it goes down to the depths of the moral life. This change is an inner change. It is such a change as revolutionizes one's life in relation to sin.

(3) Repentance and reformation. There may be a marked change in the outer life following repentance, or there may not be. Sometimes evil habits have so fastened themselves on to the life that such an inner revolution is the only thing that will change them. Sometimes there may be a marked change in the habits of life without such an inner revolution. In that case you have reformation without repentance. Sometimes the outward life may have been so correct, judged by the standards of social morality, that no special outward reformation was needed. So you may have reformation following repentance, or you may have reformation without repentance, or you may have repentance where reformation is not needed.

We are not to conclude, however, that because reformation is not needed in some cases repentance is not needed. Reformation as ordinarily spoken of means a change in which vicious moral habits are left off. A man may have no vicious moral habits, but yet need to repent of sin toward God. Not all men are grossly immoral, but all men are sinners. Sin is against God. Repentance is the repudiation of sin as against God. Repentance, therefore, is a religious act or attitude of mind. It is not simply the repudiation of the act of sin; it is

the repudiation of self as evil and sinful. It is to deny one's self and take up the cross.[1] It means death to the sinful self.

(4) The Christian life a life of repentance. We should not think of repentance as being an act performed at the beginning of the Christian life, not needing to be repeated. It is an attitude that belongs to the Christian life as a whole. The initial act of repentance is the beginning of a life of repentance. Jesus says we should take up the cross daily.[2] Paul says that Christians have died to sin,[3] but he also exhorts them to reckon themselves to be dead to sin.[4] The sinful self has to be crucified daily. The old man, as Paul calls him,[5] has more lives than the proverbial cat. He will not stay dead when killed. Oftentimes the deepest repentance does not come at the beginning of the Christian life. When one first emerges from the darkness of sin, his eyes are not yet accustomed enough to the new light of the gospel to see sin in all its heinousness. The more one lives in fellowship with a holy God, the more one sees himself as sinful and corrupt. It is not a sign of special piety to hear one boasting of his own goodness. The term good is one that Jesus says men should use with a good deal of caution.[6]

(5) Repentance and conversion. It is sometimes said that conversion is the outer change corresponding to repentance, or repentance and faith, as an inner change.[7] Sometimes it is said that conversion is made up of repentance and faith—repentance and faith being the elements in conversion.[8] Neither of these statements is objectionable. Conversion means a turning. It is that change in which one turns from sin to God. It is such a change as is evident, or becomes evident, to men. In

[1]Matt. 16: 24.
[2]Luke 9: 23.
[3]Rom. 6: 2.
[4]Rom. 6: 11.
[5]Col. 3: 9.
[6]Mark 10: 18.
[7]See Mullins, "Christian Religion," etc.
[8]See Strong, "Sys. Theology."

that sense, it is an outward change. Yet when Jesus speaks of conversion, he lays emphasis on the inner qualities of mind and heart. He says that one must turn and become as a little child in order to get into the kingdom of God.[1]

2. Faith.

(1) The meaning of faith. Faith is the aspect of conversion in which the soul turns to Christ for salvation. As shown above, it is inseparably connected with repentance. Since repentance is a believing response to the truth of the gospel concerning us as sinners, it might be included in faith. In some places in the New Testament we find faith alone stated as the condition of salvation; in others we find repentance alone; in still others we find both; while in others yet we find other terms carrying the same meaning as these terms.

Faith is a term of such rich content and deep significance that it is difficult to define it in a simple statement. Christian faith, however, might be defined as trust in Jesus Christ as Savior and surrender to him as Lord.

a. Christ the object of faith. This implies that faith is something more than belief of a doctrine or the acceptance of a dogma. No doctrine, however important, can be the object of faith in the full sense of the term. One can believe a doctrine with his intellect. He can trust a person with his heart or will. Nor is the church the object of faith. The Roman Catholic Church makes faith implicit surrender to the church, so that one is pledged to believe in the realm of doctrine what the church prescribes to be believed and practice in the realm of morals what the church prescribes to be practiced. One believes in Christ only on the authority of the church. But this falls far short of Christian faith. It is indeed a fatal perversion of faith. It puts the church in important respects where Christ belongs and calls

[1]See Matt. 18: 3.

for submission to the church such as a Christian can yield only to Christ. It enslaves the mind and conscience to the church and its hierarchy.

The place of doctrine in relation to faith is to present Christ to us as the object of faith and then to help explain the meaning of Christ as we know him in experience. Doctrine, then, has an important place in the life of faith, but no doctrine as such can be the object of faith.

Christ is the object of faith by virtue of the fact that he is the incarnation of God and is, therefore, the revelation of God's saving grace. He is the object of saving faith because he is the one who atones for sin and is thereby the one who achieves redemption for us.

Faith in Christ and faith in God are indistinguishable. We can say that we trust in Christ for salvation or that we trust in God through Christ. In the New Testament and in Christian experience, faith in Christ is faith in God.

b. Perhaps the meaning of faith can be made a little clearer if we remind ourselves of two aspects of the act of saving faith.

(a) One is that in saving faith we receive Christ as Savior. There are many ways of expressing this in the New Testament. It is called coming to Christ. "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."[1] "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden."[2] It is called receiving him. "To as many as received him, to them gave he authority (or power) to become the sons of God."[3] It is called eating his flesh and drinking his blood. Christ says, that unless we eat his flesh and drink his blood, we have no life in us; but if we eat his flesh and drink his blood he abides in us and we in him.[4] This statement of Jesus has no reference to partaking of the Lord's Supper, but it does refer to that which our partaking of the supper symbolizes. In the

[1]John 6: 37. [2]Matt. 11: 28. [3]John 1: 12. [4]John 6: 52-59.

Old Testament this act of faith is called a looking. "Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth."[1] It is called a hearing. "Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear, and your soul shall live."[2] Men are said to call upon the Lord. "It shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."[3] But the most common term is the one translated as a verb "believe," and as a noun "faith." The passages are too numerous to quote or even refer to. The meaning of the word carries with it the idea of trust, confidence, repose in one.[4]

(b) The other aspect of faith that needs emphasizing is that in faith one submits to Christ as Lord. In the same act in which we receive him as Savior, we give ourselves to him as Lord. We become his servants by virtue of the fact that he saves us from sin. Jesus emphasizes this in relation to his disciples. The very term disciple implies that we become learners in his school. We come under his authority as teacher. We must have the teachable spirit, the spirit of humility and submission. This is why Jesus says we must become as little children and have the spirit of humility.[5] Jesus emphasized this childlike humility in contrast to the spirit of pride and selfishness that desired the greatest place for self in the kingdom. The same thought is brought out clearly in Matt. 11: 25-30. Here Jesus thanks the Father that the truth has been concealed from the wise and prudent, the proud and self-sufficient in spirit, but that he has revealed it unto babes, those who are humble and teachable. Jesus says that no one can know the Father except those to whom the Son wills to reveal him. Therefore, if a man would know God, he must

[1]Isa. 45: 22.
[2]Isa. 55: 3.
[3]Acts 2: 21; Rom. 10: 13.
[4]See John 3: 14-16, 18, 36; Acts 10: 43; 13: 38, 39; 16: 31; Rom. 1: 16; Gal. 3: 26; Eph. 2: 8 and many others.
[5]Matt. 18; 1-4.

enter the school of Christ, take his yoke, submit to his authority, have the spirit of meekness after the supreme example of Jesus himself. The demand for supreme authority in our lives comes out in those passages where he says that he must come ahead of father, mother, brother, sister, wife, houses or lands, even of life itself;[1] also in the passage where he says that one can not be his disciple unless he forsakes all;[2] where he demands of the rich young ruler that he sell all and follow him;[3] where he refuses to allow one to go back to bury the dead or bid farewell to his loved ones;[4] where he makes the acknowledgment of one before the Father to depend on the confession of him by that one before men;[5] where he teaches that obedience to his teaching is the only solid foundation for character and destiny;[6] where he claims that he as judge will be the arbiter of the final destinies of men.[7] So we see that even in the synoptic Gospels Jesus presents himself as absolute Lord of conscience and of life, calling for self-surrender on our part.

In John's Gospel, we find the same truth. Jesus is one with the Father,[8] the way, the truth and the life,[9] the bread of life,[10] the light of the world,[11] the true vine of which his disciples are branches,[12] the good shepherd who gives his life for the sheep,[13] the mediator of creation, [14] the life of the world,[15] the eternal Son of God.[16] In short, all the finalities of the soul are found in him. To believe on him is not to be condemned,[17] to have eternal life;[18] not to believe on him is to be condemned, to have God's wrath abide on us.

[1]Matt. 10: 34ff; Luke 14: 26.
[2]Luke 14: 33.
[3]Mark 10: 21.
[4]Luke 9: 57-62.
[5]Matt. 10: 32, 33.
[6]Matt. 7: 24-27.
[7]Matt. 25: 31ff.
[8]10: 30.
[9]14: 6.
[10]6: 35.
[11]8: 12; 9: 5.
[12]15: 1ff.
[13]10: 11.
[14]1: 3.
[15]1: 4.
[16]1: 18.
[17]3: 18.
[18]3: 36.

Paul speaks of the obedience of faith.[1] This may mean the obedience that grows out of faith, or it may mean the obedience that is identical with faith. Whichever construction is put upon it, it is sure that Christian faith has at its heart submission to Christ as Lord. Paul delighted to call himself the slave of Jesus Christ. In Rom. 6 he shows that a Christian is one who has become the servant of righteousness.[2] Paul and Peter speak of obeying the gospel.[3] This is not submission to baptism, but submission to the Christ who is presented in the gospel as Savior and Lord.

(2) An objection to Christian faith. Here is the point where the modern objection to Christianity becomes sharpest. This objection, however, does not usually assume the guise of an objection. It usually appears in the form of an explanation that devitalizes the gospel by removing the objectionable feature. It claims the name of Christ and lauds him as the great religious leader and hero, but objects to making him Lord of the conscience and of life. In the name of freedom and the autonomy of personal life, objection is made to what the objector considers an abject surrender of one's conscience and will to another. Such a surrender, it is claimed, would destroy our freedom and degrade our personality.

But as a matter of fact, those who assume this attitude of surrender toward Christ do not find their personalities degraded, their wills weakened or their freedom lost. They find, on the other hand, that their wills are set free and that they are given a power over themselves and their environment and especially over moral evil that they never knew before and in many cases that they never dreamed possible. It is this freedom in the gospel that Paul urges the Galatians that they should not surrender but contend for.[4] The point to remem-

[1]Rom. 1: 5.
[2]Vs. 18.
[3]2 Thess. 1: 8; 1 Peter 4: 17.
[4]Gal. 5: 1.

ber here, however, is that this freedom comes only by a faith that makes one the willing slave of Jesus Christ. This is one of the paradoxes of the gospel for which logic furnishes no explanation; it is understood only when experienced. As a matter of experience, however, it is as clear and definite as the experience of vision or hearing.

Man thinks that his first need is freedom. His first need is a master. Freedom comes only by submission to Jesus Christ as rightful Lord. Anything short of this attitude of trust and worship toward Jesus Christ falls short of Christian faith. In Eph. 5 Paul uses the illustration of husband and wife to set forth the relation between Christ and the church. Sometimes a woman objects in the name of freedom to being subject to a husband. But it is only in subjection to the lordship of love that the true woman finds the fulfilment of her womanly nature and the realization of her normal aspirations. Of course, the domination of the wife by brute force on the part of the husband is a degradation of her personality. But this is not the kind of subjection that Paul talks about as the divine ideal for the marriage relation. Nor is the lordship of Christ in the Christian's life the domination of force; it is the mastery of the soul by the love of God embodied in Christ and realized by faith in him. It is a mastery that sets one free from the dominion of sin—sets him free, however, not to be a law unto himself, not to throw off all moral restraint and authority and be a spiritual anarchist in the kingdom of God, but sets him free to serve God.

There is a certain type of mind, delighting to call itself "modern," that is infatuated with the idea of autonomy in the moral and spiritual life. This type of mind thinks that for the soul to be free all external authority must be rejected. But the choice here is not a choice between the authority of Christ and freedom; it is a choice between the authority of Christ that brings

freedom and the dominion of sin. The power of Christ is the only power that can set the soul free from the dominion of sin. This he does by subduing the soul by the power of his redeeming grace. But this grace becomes operative in the soul only as the soul is mastered by it. The dominion of sin from which the soul needs to be delivered does not necessarily take the form of sensuality; it may be the type of self-centered life just spoken of that denies in principle its dependence for the truth on any power or person outside of itself, particularly any Person above the realm to which it belongs. But the self-centered life is a sinful life, whether it manifests itself in the form of sensuality or in the form of intellectual and moral pride that denies one's dependence on rightful authority. It was this kind of spirit that Jesus rebuked in the cities of his day and that called out his great saying in Matt. 11: 25ff in which he commends the childlike spirit and shows the necessity of possessing that spirit if one would know the truth and have spiritual rest. It was this same spirit that made the cross of Christ a stumblingblock to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks; and it is this same spirit that makes the cross of Christ and his spiritual authority over the soul of man both a stumblingblock and foolishness to some "modern" minds. It was this spirit that, while proudly parading its submission to the authority of the law, desired to make a show of the flesh and win its own salvation by keeping the law rather than accept the gospel of the grace of God.

(3) Why salvation is conditioned upon faith. Paul says that justification is by faith that it might be according to grace.[1] Faith and grace are correlative ideas. Each implies the other. If salvation is to be of grace on God's part, it must be by faith on man's part. Salvation by grace means salvation as a free gift on God's part. But God can not give except as man receives.

[1]Rom. 4: 16.

Receiving salvation as an unmerited gift on God's part is faith. God gives salvation, man receives.

Opposed to Paul's idea of salvation by grace through faith was the doctrine of salvation by works; that is, that man by his obedience to the law was to deserve salvation. Paul strenuously opposed this on the ground that it would utterly pervert the gospel. When the Judaizers insisted that Gentiles who accepted the gospel should also be circumcized and keep the law, Paul objected, holding that faith in Christ was sufficient to save. He said that this would make salvation a matter of debt on God's part rather than a matter of grace.[1]

There are, then, no conditions of salvation that have been prescribed in any arbitrary way. The only conditions are the conditions that are necessarily involved in the relations of a God of mercy, who would, as a matter of grace, save an undeserving sinner to the sinner that he would save. The moral relations in the case make it impossible for God to save the sinner who does not recognize and acknowledge his sinful condition and cast himself in his helpfulness upon a God of grace. That is to say, God cannot save a sinner without making the sinner willing to be saved. In this sense, repentance and faith are not conditions of salvation; they rather constitute salvation; that is, saving a sinner means to bring him to that state of mind in which he renounces sin and trusts himself to a God of grace. As the necessary moral relations involved in the case repentance and faith are the universal and invariable conditions of salvation. Or using faith as including repentance, we may say that faith and faith alone is the condition of salvation. God himself could not save the sinner without faith on the sinner's part. To say that he could would be to say that God saved a man without saving him.

[1]Rom. 4: 4.

It follows, then, that the conditions of salvation have never changed. To say that some men were saved in one age of the world on one set of conditions, and other men in another age of the world on other conditions is to make God an arbitrary God. It is nonsense to say that men were saved in Old Testament times by the law and in New Testament times by the gospel. Not one man was ever saved by the law, because no man could keep its requirements.[1] To say that men were saved by the law would make void the gospel of the grace of God. Men were saved in Old Testament times just as they are in New Testament times, by faith in God and his promises of grace.[2]

It will be readily seen that this excludes baptism or any other ceremony or rite, as a condition of salvation. Paul says the gospel is the power of God unto salvation.[3] He clearly distinguishes between preaching the gospel and baptizing, in a way that would have been impossible if he had thought of baptism as a prerequisite to the enjoyment of salvation through the gospel.[4] On the other hand, Paul regards baptism as symbolical of a salvation procured by faith.[5] The expression of Peter about being baptized into the remission of sins[6] can be explained in the same way; that is, that baptism symbolizes our entrance into a state of remission of sins. John 3: 5 probably does not refer to baptism at all, but to the cleansing from sin in the new birth, of which baptism is the symbol. In Acts 22: 16, Ananias told Paul to rise and be baptized and wash away his sins. This can be taken either literally, after the manner of the Roman Catholic Church, or symbolically, as Baptists do. Between these two positions there is no standing ground either in logic or Scripture. The Catholic posi-

[1]See Acts 13: 39; Rom. 7: 10ff; Gal. 2: 16.
[2]See Rom. 4.
[3]Rom. 1: 16.
[4]1 Cor. 1: 14-17.
[5]Rom. 6: 1-4.
[6]Acts 2: 38.

tion utterly perverts the whole gospel order and denies the doctrine of salvation by grace. So does any other position that makes man's salvation from sin to depend on baptism or anything else than faith in the crucified and risen Redeemer.

But some one may say that, since faith is the sinner's act and since faith is the condition of salvation, after all the sinner's salvation depends on something that the sinner himself does. And since the sinner's salvation is to depend on something that the sinner does, why should it not depend on baptism as well as on faith? Why could not God make baptism a condition of salvation as well as faith? The answer is, that, in the sense that this question implies, God did not make faith a condition of salvation. As pointed out above, faith is not an arbitrarily appointed condition of salvation. Faith is the condition of salvation, because the moral relations of the case demand faith. The grace of God that gives salvation must be appropriated by man's faith. Otherwise grace is in vain. But any act not necessarily involved in the moral relations of the case, if made a condition of salvation, would be an arbitrary prescription on God's part.

Moreover, faith as a condition of salvation is not an act by which man merits or earns anything. It is the act by which the bankrupt sinner receives the grace of God. It is an act in which the sinner puts all his trust for salvation in another and in what that other has done for him. It is not an act in which the sinner makes any claims for himself; it is rather an act in which he acknowledges that he can not help himself and in which he signs away his life to another. It is an act of utter self-abandon to another. So there is involved in the act of faith the very opposite of any claim to doing anything by which one wins the favor of God; it is an act in which one acknowledges the utter impossibility

of doing this and by which one casts himself on Christ and what he has done for his acceptance with God.

(4) The relation of faith to a life of righteousness. The objection is sometimes made to the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith that it would encourage one to live a life of spiritual ease and sin rather than one of good works and righteousness. This has been a standing objection since the days of Paul. He anticipated this objection in his letter to the Romans. Doubtless he had come across it many times in his contest with the Judaizers. Paul shows[1] that a Christian is one who has died to sin and been made alive to righteousness by faith in Christ. This constitutes a moral guarantee (the only kind of guarantee that will apply in the case) that the Christian will live a life of righteousness. It is morally impossible for him to do anything else.

It is sometimes thought that James and Paul do not agree on this question. Paul says that one is justified by faith apart from works of law.[2] James says that a man is justified by works and not only by faith.[3] But we must remember two differences in point of view between Paul and James. One is that they are using the term works in somewhat different senses. Paul is talking about legalistic works, works as a basis for meriting the favor of God. And Paul's view was that as a basis for a sinner's acceptance with God works of law were utterly useless. James is talking about works as the outgrowth and expression of a living faith. Again, Paul's question was: Upon what condition is a sinner justified before God? His answer is: Upon condition of faith, not on condition of works as a meritorious basis. James' question was: What kind of faith is it that justifies? Is it faith that produces good works, or faith that only repeats a formal creed? His answer is that faith that produces no works is a dead faith and

[1]Rom. 6: 1ff.
[2]Rom. 3: 28.
[3]James 2: 24.

he contends that that kind of faith will not save.[1] No doubt Paul would have endorsed James' contention, and James would have agreed with Paul. There is no contradiction unless one insists on taking the author's words apart from their connection and without reference to the author's intention. In that case language has no meaning whatever.

It is not true that salvation by faith encourages one to a life of sin and discourages a life of righteousness. On the other hand, faith in Christ as Savior from sin is the only thing that will lift one out of a self-centered life and produce a life of righteousness. True righteousness is not possible as long as one lives a self-centered life. The doctrine of salvation by works leads to a self-centered life. But in the act of faith one looks beyond self; he trusts in another. He gives himself up to another. Moreover, faith unites to Christ and his Spirit becomes the controlling power of the Christian's life. As Christ gave himself for us, so those who follow him will give themselves to him and to the service of their fellows. Gratitude to God for a salvation received as the gift of his grace will not let one live for self while the world is dying for what he can give.

II. **Union with Christ.** We have seen that salvation is by faith. Faith saves because it is the bond that unites the soul to God in Christ. Our salvation is in Christ Jesus. In him we find God and salvation from sin. "Jehovah is my light and my salvation."[2] His power and his alone can redeem from sin. In finding him we find salvation.

1. The New Testament clearly teaches this union. This union of the believer with Christ is represented in many ways in the New Testament. But it is Paul and John that present to us most clearly and fully this union. Paul and John, in the good sense of the word,

[1]James 2: 14. [2]Ps. 27: 1.

are mystics. They emphasize this immediate contact of the soul with the living Christ. In John's Gospel Christ is the bread of life;[1] by eating his flesh and drinking his blood we dwell in him and he in us;[2] he is the good shepherd in whose hands we find safety;[3] he is the vine, we are the branches;[4] he is in us, we are in him.[5] Paul also uses a number of expressions that set forth this union with Christ. Christ is the head, we are members of his body;[6] he is the husband, the church the wife;[7] he is to us what the foundation is to a building.[8] We are crucified with Christ;[9] we are risen with him;[10] we are buried with him in baptism;[11] we suffer with him and shall be glorified with him.[12] In union with him, Paul says he can do all things.[13] He is so vitally related to Christ that he can say: "To me to live is Christ."[14]

2. This union with Christ is by faith. In John 6: 56, Jesus says that if we eat his flesh and drink his blood we abide in him and he in us. This means faith. In Gal. 2: 20, Paul says that the life which he now lives, which is Christ living in him, is by faith in the Son of God. In Eph. 3: 17 Paul prays for the Ephesians that Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith.

3. This conception of union with Christ by faith has no meaning apart from the New Testament teaching that Jesus is now the risen, reigning Lord. The faith that saves is not simply faith that looks back to the historic Jesus; it looks up to the living Christ. Christ is a living person with whom we must be vitally united by faith if he saves us from our sins. The cry "back to Christ," meaning back to the historic Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels and away from the transcendent

[1]6: 35.
[2]6: 56.
[3]10: 27, 28.
[4]15: 1ff.
[5]14: 20.
[6]Rom. 12: 4ff; 1 Cor. 12: 12ff.
[7]Eph. 5: 22ff.
[8]1 Cor. 3: 10ff; Eph. 2: 20.
[9]Gal. 2: 20.
[10]Col. 3: 1.
[11]Rom. 6: 4.
[12]Rom. 8: 17.
[13]Phil. 4: 13.
[14]Phil. 1: 21.

Christ of Paul and John, is a motto that means to devitalize Christianity, for merely a historic Christ can not save. He must be superhistoric. As a matter of fact the Christ of the Synoptic Gospels is just as transcendent as the Christ of John and Paul. But some of the critics think they get in the Synoptic Gospels a Christ with no element in him that can not be measured in terms of human life and history. The Christ who is presented in the New Testament as the object of saving faith is the Jesus who having been slain by wicked hands was raised from the dead by God.[1] He is the Christ who in the Spirit can be called Lord.[2] We do not merely reach back by a stretch of imagination over nineteen centuries to the Jesus of history; we reach up by faith to the Christ who lives and reigns at the right hand of God.

4. This union with the living Christ is union with God. The significance of this union with Christ is that in him we come to know God with all that that implies. To talk about union with Christ signifies nothing if he is nothing more than a historic character whom we know through the New Testament records. These records are essential, for the Christ we know in Christian experience is not another than the historic Christ, yet he is more than historic. He not only lived a life in time and space, but in his resurrection and ascension he transcended the historical order. And when we know him as the transcendent Christ we are conscious that in knowing him we know God. Our consciousness of union with Christ and with God are inseparable. No man knows the Father except the one to whom the Son wills to reveal him.[3] For a knowledge of God we are absolutely dependent on Jesus Christ his only begotten Son. But in and through the Son we do know the Father. It is not a question between knowing God in Christ and

[1]Acts 2: 23, 24; 5: 30, 31.
[2]1 Cor. 12: 3.
[3]Matt. 11: 27.

knowing God outside of Christ. It is a choice between knowing God in Christ and not knowing him at all. The claims of Jesus in this respect are absolutely true to experience and have been vindicated in experience. Outside of an experimental knowledge of Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord men may speculate about God and come to hold certain opinions about him that are correct; but they never come to know God himself. But by faith in Jesus as Savior and Lord men are vitally united to God in an experience that constitutes such a knowledge of God as means nothing less than salvation from sin.

5. This union with Christ is not to be interpreted after the pantheistic fashion. Our union with Christ does not mean the losing of the finite self in the infinite All. The surrender of our wills to the will of God in Christ does not mean the losing of our wills. It does not mean to annul personality. It does not mean the throwing off of moral responsibility by merging oneself in the impersonal Absolute. It means rather the finding of oneself. The prodigal son went home to his father when he came to himself.[1] One never comes to himself until he comes to Christ. When one comes to Christ he finds his will invigorated, his mind quickened, his moral nature renewed—he finds himself.

6. Dr. Strong was true to New Testament teaching when he summed up our salvation in the idea of union with Christ and made that the controlling idea in his discussion of salvation.[2] Every blessing that we enjoy as Christians grows out of our union with Christ. A full discussion, therefore, of union with Christ would involve all that follows in regard to salvation. So we will take up next what God does for us in Christ.

III. **God's saving act.** It has been customary to regard God's saving work from two points of view, the

[1]Luke 15: 17. [2]See "Sys. Theol.," Vol. III.

juristic or forensic and the experimental or biological. In one of these, it is said, we come into a new standing with God; in the other we are given newness of life. In one we are changed in our relation with God; in the other we are changed in our moral nature. In one we are justified; in the other regenerated. One is objective; the other subjective. One takes place outside of us; the other within us.

This is a valid distinction, but we must remember that it can not be pressed too far. A good deal of discussion has been had as to which of these aspects of salvation preceded the other; which was fundamental and which secondary. But we must remember that these are not two separated acts on God's part. God does not justify in one act and regenerate in another. These are two ways of regarding the one saving act of God. Neither aspect precedes the other. Neither is complete without the other.

And it is doubtful if more is not lost than gained in trying to class the terms used in the New Testament for God's saving activity under one of these two heads. It would probably be better to understand that the one saving act of God may be looked at from a number of points of view and that this is what we have in the different terms used in the New Testament with reference to God's saving activity. We will consider now some of the terms used in the Bible to set forth what God does for us in Christ in saving us.

1. In Christ we have forgiveness of sins.

(1) Scriptures setting forth this idea. This is one of the fundamental blessings in salvation. Salvation is deliverance from sin. In Old Testament times emphasis was laid on other forms of deliverance, such as deliverance from enemies,[1] deliverance from disease,[2] and deliverance from death.[3] But even in the Old Testament salvation

[1]Ps. 27: 1ff; Jer. 23: 5ff.
[2]Ps. 103: 3.
[3]Ps. 49: 14, 15.

from sin was the chief blessing. We might look at several passages in which forgiveness of sins is set forth. In Ps. 32 David speaks of the blessedness of the man "whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." The Lord does not impute to him iniquity and in his spirit there is no guile. As long as he kept silence and refused to confess his sin, God's hand was heavy upon him; he was scorched with the drought of summer. But when he confessed his sin, the Lord forgave the iniquity of his sin. We have a close parallel to this in Ps. 51. This psalm is even yet a classic, and will be to the end of time, in which a soul convicted of sin pours out its confession to a God of mercy and pleads for forgiveness and cleansing. The penitent in each of these cases has come to recognize that sin has broken his communion with God and that there is no possibility of peace and joy for him until his sin is forgiven and he is cleansed from its defilement. In Ps. 103, along with the blessing of being healed of disease, praise is ascribed to Jehovah because he forgives iniquities (vs. 3). He does not deal with us after our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities (vs. 10). Because of his transcendent lovingkindness (vs. 11) and fatherly pity (vs. 13), he removes our transgressions as far from us as the east is from the west (vs. 12).

In Jer. 31: 31-34, the prophet tells about a new covenant that Jehovah will make with his people. This covenant will not be like the old covenant that he made with them in delivering them from Egypt. That covenant they did not keep. This covenant will be based on a greater deliverance than the deliverance from Egypt. It will be based on a deliverance from sin. He will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will he remember no more. This will give such an inner knowledge of God that they will keep this covenant. By this forgiveness the knowledge of God will be put in their hearts.

In the New Testament the forgiveness of sins is one of the fundamental blessings that men were to receive in the Messianic salvation. John the Baptist was to "go before the face of the Lord to make ready his ways; to give knowledge of salvation in the remission of sins."[1] Forgiveness of sins was one of the elemental blessings that Jesus taught his disciples to pray for.[2] After the resurrection Jesus commissioned his disciples to preach, in his name, remission of sins, upon condition of repentance, to all the nations.[3] Peter announced to the people at Pentecost that after repentance they should be baptized into the remission of sins.[4] He preached to Cornelius and the company assembled at his house that the prophets all bear witness that through the name of Jesus every one who believes on him shall receive remission of sins.[5]

In Eph. 1: 7 Paul says: "In whom (Christ) we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses."[6] This seems to identify redemption and forgiveness of sins; at least, it makes forgiveness the chief element in redemption. Without forgiveness there is no redemption.

This list of passages is by no means exhaustive, but it is representative of the teaching of the Bible on the subject. It shows that forgiveness of sins was the fundamental blessing of the gospel of Christ. That idea was not unknown to Old Testament saints, but the idea comes out in its clearness and fullness in the new dispensation. The book of Hebrews shows that the forgiveness of sins was an essential element in the new covenant. It was in the forgiveness of sins that men should know God.[7] This was in accordance with the prophecy of Jeremiah.[8]

[1]Luke 1: 76, 77.
[2]Matt. 6: 12; Luke 11: 4.
[3]Luke 24: 47.
[4]Acts 2: 38.
[5]Acts 10: 43.
[6]Cf. Col. 1: 14.
[7]8: 11, 12.
[8]Jer. 31: 31-34.

(2) The meaning of forgiveness. We might inquire a little more particularly as to what is meant by the forgiveness of sins. The term translated to forgive in the New Testament means to send away. It is exactly our term to remit, send back or away. To remit sins is to put them away. But still the question remains: To put them away in what sense? What does it mean to put away sins? It does not mean to put away in any mechanical or spatial sense. Sins can not be put away thus. To remit sins is evidently a figure of speech. Sometimes the matter was thought of as analogous to the releasing of a debtor. Jesus thought of it thus when he taught the disciples to pray: "Forgive our debts as we forgive our debtors."[1] We have the impressive statements in the Old Testament that God puts our sins behind his back[2] and remembers them no more.[3] He casts them in the depths of the sea.[4] He washes us, and makes us whiter than snow.[5]

It is not exactly true to say that to forgive sin is to make us as if we had not sinned. This is not true in the consciousness of the sinner. The consciousness of a forgiven sinner is not the same as the consciousness of one who has not sinned. "Once a sinner always a sinner—in this sense at least, that he who has but once sinned can never be as if he had never sinned. His very blessedness to all eternity is a different thing from the blessedness of the sinless. The man whose iniquity is not imputed is a very different being from the man whose iniquity was never committed."[6]

But forgiveness does mean that sin is removed as a barrier to our fellowship with God. Sin breaks man's fellowship with God. It is a personal offense against

[1]Matt. 6: 12.
[2]Isa. 38: 17.
[3]Jer. 31: 34.
[4]Micah 7: 19.
[5]Ps. 51: 7.
[6]Forsythe, "Christian Perfection, pp. 5, 6.

God. "Against thee, thee only have I sinned, and done that which is evil in thy sight."[1] "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, so that he will not hear."[2] As the Holy One of Israel, Jehovah will not accept the offerings of a sinful and rebellious people, nor hear their prayers. They must repent of their sins and do the right.[3] But when sin is forgiven, the block to fellowship is removed. The cloud that shut out the face of God is blotted out. In this sense sin is remitted, sent away. It is like the revival of human fellowship after friends or loved ones have been separated by a wrong done by one to another. Forgiveness sought and obtained renews the former intimacy of confidence and love. It is this that gives to one the uplifting sense of freedom, peace and joy upon realizing that his sins are forgiven. He is released from the enslaving sense of guilt. A great burden is gone from the soul. A new light comes in. Often the whole face of nature seems to be transformed. A joy unspeakable and full of glory comes into the soul. We realize that we are loosed from our sins,[4] which have bound and enslaved us.

Forgiveness is a personal act that law, physical, social, or moral, can not explain. Law knows nothing of forgiveness. There are those to-day who insist that law reigns in the world, and that there can be no variation from the reign of law; law is supreme and invariable. It does not make any difference what form the law may take; it may be physical law or it may be moral; but if law speaks the last word, forgiveness is excluded. There can be forgiveness only where personality and personal relations are the ultimate reality. God is a person and God is more than law, physical or moral. If a man does not believe in a personal God, he can not believe in forgiveness of sins. On the other hand, the experience of the forgiveness of sins gives one such an

[1]Ps. 51: 4.
[2]Isa. 59: 2.
[3]Isa. 1.
[4]Rev. 1: 5.

assurance of relationship with a personal God that one can not lose the consciousness of God without also losing the sense of forgiven sin. This transcendent act of God is an act that not only carries with it the idea of God's personality; it is also an act of grace on his part. As such it transcends law. Grace does not nullify law, but it transcends law. Law can not forgive, but God can. Law can not forgive, because law knows nothing about grace. Grace is a personal quality. It is the highest conceivable quality of moral character. Law can not have character. Character belongs only to a person. Forgiveness, therefore, is an act of grace on the part of a personal God; and in this act the God of grace rises above, but does not violate or nullify law.

But while this transcendent personal act on the part of God removes sin as that which blocks our fellowship with him, it does not immediately remove all the consequences of our sin. It does not take us out of the physical, historical, social and moral order of things with which we are connected. It does show man's superiority to this order. It reveals man as of more worth than the whole order of things to which he belongs and of which he is the climax and goal. It shows that man is not enslaved in that order. It makes man the master of the order of things. It shows that this order exists for man. Nothing shows the transcendent worth of man and his mastery of the world order like the grace of God that forgives sins.

The grace of God that forgives sins and thus restores the sinner to the fellowship of a holy God will finally deliver the forgiven sinner from all the evil consequences of his sin. This is true both with reference to the individual and the redeemed race. Sin broke man's fellowship with God and brought spiritual death followed by a whole horde of evils consequent upon sin and spiritual death. When sin is forgiven man's fellowship with God is restored and as a consequence all the ills that

followed upon sin will be removed, but this can not be done at a bound. To do so would probably mean violently to dislocate man from his historical, social and moral connections as a member of the race and as a part of the order of nature.

For instance, a body that is maimed by disease, caused by sin, is not, usually at least, restored to perfect soundness upon the forgiveness of sin. If one wastes the strength of youth in prodigal living, God will gladly forgive the penitent prodigal when he returns home, but the substance of his physical and sometimes his mental manhood is not given back to him in this life. Again, the social results of our sins are not always at once counteracted when our sins are forgiven. God forgave David his awful sins in connection with Bathsheba and Uriah, but the sword never departed from David's house until his death. Many a bitter tear he shed over the consequences of his sin, although he knew the sweetness of God's forgiving grace. We see this clearly in the matter of physical death. The heart of the penalty of sin is spiritual death. But physical death came in consequence of sin. When one is forgiven, spiritual death is removed and the sinner restored to communion with God. This means that in the end death in its completeness and totality will be abolished, but not this side of the resurrection. There are intimations, also, that the whole natural order will be renewed in the final consummation of things.[1]

But while we are not at once delivered from all the consequences of our sins, when we are forgiven, we are put in such a relation with God that all the ills of life may become redemptive forces in our lives working for the one supreme purpose of transforming us into the image of Christ.[2] This will be discussed later on in connection with the Christian doctrine of providence.

[1]Cf. the section on the relation of natural evil to sin and its penalty, p. 174ff.

[2]See Rom. 8: 28ff.

The experience of the forgiveness of sins as a gracious act on God's part, not only removes sin as a barrier to fellowship with God, it gives one an insight into the character of God that otherwise would be impossible. In other words, the forgiven sinner understands God, and consequently has a fellowship with God, that would be impossible for a man who had never sinned. How could a man who had never sinned understand that element in God's character that we express by the term grace? The grace of God is the most glorious element in his character according to the Christian view. This grace we know only in its redeeming work in our lives. A sinless being can never know a God of grace. The conception would have no meaning to him. Sometimes the preacher says that God might have sent angels to announce the gospel to sinful men rather than send redeemed sinners. But to say the least of it, this is doubtful. What would an unfallen angel know about the grace of God that saves a sinner? The sinner who has experienced God's redeeming grace knows, and can make the other sinner know, something of that grace. He has an insight and a fellowship, an undying love for a God of grace that an unfallen sinner, man or angel, will be a stranger to for all eternity. Redemption in Christ, then, does not put man back in the place of an unfallen Adam. It puts him on a new basis, gives him an insight into God's character and fellowship with God that such an Adam could never have. It, therefore, gives him a type of holiness that would be impossible for such an unfallen man. For instance, the redeemed sinner will, as a result of an experience of God's grace in saving him, have reproduced in his life the quality of grace in relation to his fellows. This is seen in that the redeemed man has in him the spirit of grace as manifested in his evangelistic and missionary spirit. Such

a spirit is not something incidental or accidental in the Christian life; it is of the essence of Christianity. An unfallen Adam might be a man of legalistic justice; he could hardly be a man of grace. Hence the redeemed sinner will be a better man than the unfallen Adam could ever have been. This does not mean to excuse or to condone sin but to glorify the grace of God.

We might say, then, that the forgiveness of sins is the fundamental blessing in salvation, and that the forgiveness of sins through the grace of God changes the whole of life into a redemptive order. The ills of life that before were of a fundamentally retributive aspect now become primarily remedial and redemptive in that they can, by God's grace, be made to contribute to the development of Christian character.

(3) Objections to the doctrine of forgiveness. We may now consider two objections to the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins through the grace of God. One is an objection to the doctrine from the standpoint of the divine nature; the other is with reference to the supposed effect of the doctrine upon the life of the forgiven sinner.

The first objection is that the doctrine of forgiveness is not consistent with the unchangeableness of the divine nature. God can not change, we are told. So the change is not in God, it is in the sinner. It is like riding a bicycle against the wind. While one is riding against the wind, he feels the force of the wind resisting him and holding him back. But when he turns round and rides with the wind, he feels the wind bearing him on. So, while living in sin and resisting God, one is conscious of the divine resistance; but when one readjusts himself in his relation to sin and God, he feels the divine love and approval bearing him on toward the goal. But just as it was not the wind but the rider that changed, so we are told, it is not God that changes, but man. When man changes, he feels as if God had changed. This is some-

times carried to the extent of denying that God changes in his attitude toward the sinner. All the change, we are told, is in the sinner.

But while it is true that the sinner changes when he repents of his sin toward God, this only states one side of the matter. God does not change in his ultimate purposes concerning the individual or the race, in his attributes or his nature, but God does change in his attitude toward the sinner when the sinner changes. God is not the slave of his own immutability. Nor is God an impersonal force. He is a moral personality. As a person he can will. As moral his attitude is not the same toward the sinner and the righteous. This objection would not only make forgiveness impossible; it would make any new beginning on God's part impossible. There could be no miracle. The incarnation is logically ruled out on this ground. God could not have willed at a definite point in history to enter into an essentially new relation to the race in the person of Jesus Christ. Creation also would be impossible. So would recreation or regeneration. Revelation as an act of self-disclosure on God's part goes too; on this view revelation is only man's feeling out after, and perhaps his discovery of, some truth about God. Everything distinctive in Christianity would disappear on this view. God becomes only an impersonal force and his immutability becomes the stagnation of death.

This objection falls in with the view that denies that God pronounces upon the sinner any condemnation. As guilt is interpreted to mean only a guilt consciousness, so forgiveness is interpreted to mean only a subjective feeling on the sinner's part, not involving any change on God's part. The change was in the sinner. But we must insist that forgiveness is more than a subjective feeling to which corresponds no objective reality. We must maintain this position if we would do justice either to the Biblical teaching or to Christian experience. For-

giveness is God's act. He changes his attitude toward the penitent sinner. It is the apprehension of this changed attitude on God's part that brings peace and joy to the sinner's heart.

This is practically the same objection as the one considered a few paragraphs back in which forgiveness was denied on the ground of the inviolability of law. It makes no difference whether God is enslaved by his own immutability or the invariability of law; in either case his personal activity in forgiving sin is denied and in either case salvation in the Christian sense of the term is impossible. The view of forgiveness implied in this objection answers to the view of sin that speaks of the guilt consciousness of the sinner but denies or ignores guilt as an objective reality in the sinner's relation to God. If there is no objective guilt, there is no need of an objective forgiveness. If God does not condemn sin, there is no need that he should forgive. If, on the other hand, God as a holy God condemns sin, the only hope for the sinner is in God's forgiving grace. If sin, as committed against God's holiness, breaks man's fellowship with God, then the only thing that can renew that fellowship is to have the guilt of sin removed in an act of remission that puts away the guilt of sin.

The other objection to the doctrine of forgiveness as an act of grace on God's part is that it will encourage the sinner to live in sin. This objection was briefly considered in discussing faith as the condition of salvation. But we need to look at it here from the point of view of forgiveness as God's gracious act. Will God's gracious forgiveness of sin encourage the forgiven sinner to live in sin? We answer, "No; but on the other hand it will deliver from sin."

Briefly consider some reasons for this answer. First, because forgiveness is on the basis of the atoning work of Jesus. Sin is not forgiven without an adequate expression of God's holy displeasure against sin. In the

cross of Christ God condemned the world's sin. Let no one think that forgiveness is an easy-going thing, either for God or for man. If one thinks that forgiveness is an easy matter let him remember how hard it is for man to forgive his fellowman; for society to forgive those who violate its conventions and proprieties; for the state to forgive the criminal. Forgiveness cost God much. It cost him his best, even his only begotten Son. It is in the blood of Jesus that we have redemption, even the forgiveness of our trespasses.[1] It is in the blood of Jesus that we are loosed from our sins.[2]

Secondly, because our forgiveness is conditioned upon our repentance. In repentance we repudiate sin. We condemn sin with something of the same hatred and horror of it that God had for it in condemning it in Christ's cross. This is a revolutionary, a regenerative experience. One can never think, feel or act toward sin as he did, before repenting.

This is brought out in what Jesus says about our forgiveness as being conditioned on our forgiving our fellowman. Jesus says that if we forgive not, neither will the heavenly Father forgive us.[3] How searching is that statement! How exacting of petty, vengeful human nature! Forgiveness is such a revolutionary experience that one can not claim it unless he finds reproduced in his own attitude toward his fellowman something of God's gracious attitude toward him. Only as God's grace reproduces itself in us can we claim that grace has nullified sin in us. Unless our fellowship with the God of grace is so renewed that we find ourselves in a very practical and searching way manifesting a genuine communion of that grace, we can not claim that our sins are put away by his grace. "There is forgiveness with thee that thou mayest be feared."[4] What a sense of reverence, of awe, of holy horror for sin and righteous

[1]Eph. 1: 7; Col. 1: 14.
[2]Rev. 1: 5.
[3]Matt. 6: 15.
[4]Ps. 130: 4.

fear of God did we find in our hearts when first we found that by faith in the crucified One our sins had been remitted! And with each passing day the wonder grows, our horror of sin deepens and our reverential fear of God, the God of all grace, increases.

2. In Christ we are justified.

(1) The doctrine defined. Justification is the act of God in which the sinner, hitherto condemned on account of his sin, upon condition of faith in Christ, is forgiven and received into the divine favor. Justification is mainly, if not exclusively, a Pauline doctrine in the New Testament. Paul uses this term mainly rather than the term forgiveness of sins. In Paul's writings is the only place the doctrine is stated with anything like thoroughness or completeness. He sets the doctrine forth in the letters to the Galatians and the Romans. There is so much in common between the ideas of forgiveness of sins and justification that it will not be necessary to give a full treatment of justification here. Practically all that has been said about forgiveness will apply to justification. As previously stated, they do not denote two acts of God or experiences on the part of the sinner, but they denote the same transaction looked at from somewhat different points of view. Justification, however, is a somewhat different idea from the forgiveness of sins.

Note two differences. One is that justification is a forensic or law term. The word means to declare just. It is the legal term for acquitting one accused of crime. It is the term that Paul uses for the act of pardoning or acquitting the sinner condemned on account of sin. But it does not denote, as some say, the act of pardoning without being received into God's favor. God is not neutral toward man. So when the sinner is pardoned, he is restored to the divine favor. The thing that necessitates justification is the sinner's condemnation by the law. Justification is the removal of this condemnation. Forgiveness is more of a personal idea. It removes sin

as that which breaks our personal fellowship with God. Justification deals with sin as that which brings on us the condemnation of the law.

Another difference is that justification is something that takes place once for all. It is never repeated. It does not need repeating. It brings one into a new relation with God which is never reversible. Forgiveness needs repeating in the life of the Christian as often as sin weakens or breaks his fellowship with God. But the justified sinner never comes again under the condemnation of the law. Therefore he never needs to be justified again. This is the advantage of Paul's use of this idea. It denotes that the penitent sinner is brought into a relation with God which he will never lose. He comes not again into condemnation.

(2) A one-sided statement of the doctrine. This doctrine has sometimes suffered from a one-sided interpretation and a wrong emphasis. The emphasis with some theologians has been on the fact that it is a declarative rather than an efficient act on God's part; that is, we are told, it is an act in which the sinner is regarded and treated as righteous rather than an act in which he is made righteous. The emphasis is placed on the fact that it is a legal or forensic term. For one to be declared "not guilty" in court, it is said, does not mean that one has not committed the crime of which he is accused; it means that he is released so far as the law is concerned. So, we are told, justification is an act in which God declares the sinner just in his relation with the law; but it does not mean that one is actually righteous; nor does it mean that God makes him righteous.

The ground, it is said, of this declarative act on God's part is the atonement of Christ. In the atonement, our sins were charged to him, and in justification his righteousness was imputed to us. Sometimes this was carried so far as to distinguish between the passive and the active obedience of Christ—the former denoting his suf-

ferings, the latter his righteous life. In justification the passive obedience was imputed to us so as to be the ground of our deliverance from the guilt of sin; the active obedience was imputed to us so as to become the ground of our being received into the divine favor.

But the Scriptures do not distinguish between the active and the passive obedience of Christ. They rather present the sufferings of Christ as an act of obedience to God. Paul does this in Phil. 2: 5ff where we see that the self-emptying of Christ came to its climax in the death on the cross, which, Paul says, was obedience on his part. Nor does the New Testament anywhere say, in so many words, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us or that our sins were imputed to him. It does say that God imputed Abraham's faith to him for righteousness.[1] It says that in justification or reconciliation our sins are not imputed to us.[2] It says that Christ was made sin for us that we might become the righteousness of God in him.[3]

(3) An objection to the doctrine. This emphasis on justification as a declarative or judicial act has led to an objection to the doctrine. That objection says that the doctrine is untrue in that it holds that God declares one to be righteous when he is not. Justification, so the objector holds, thus gives one an imputed or fictitious righteousness. This has led to a rejection, on the part of some, of the whole doctrine of justification as legalistic and artificial, while they hold to the idea of regeneration or moral transformation through faith in Christ. Usually with this rejection of the idea of justification has gone the rejection of the substitutionary view of the atonement.

But the emphasis on justification as a declarative or forensic act as distinguished from an efficient act is hardly just. Justification is an efficient act. It does

[1]Rom. 4: 3. [2]2 Cor. 5: 19. [3]2 Cor. 5: 21.

make one righteous. It makes one righteous in his relation with God, and there is nothing more fundamental in one's life than his relation with God. The distinction has sometimes been made that justification gives one a new standing before God, while regeneration gives one a new life; justification gives one a new relation to God, regeneration gives one a new nature. It has been said that Paul, in the first five chapters of Romans, discusses justification and does not discuss the new life (regeneration) until the sixth chapter. But this is a distinction and a contrast that is wholly foreign to Paul's mind. To Paul condemnation and death were one and inseparable, and so were justification and life. The thing that brought life to the man dead in trespasses and sins was the justifying act of God which brought him into right relation with God. Paul speaks of it as the justification of life.[1] Jesus says that the one who believes has eternal life and comes not into condemnation.[2]

Instead of its being true that Paul's doctrine of justification by faith is legalistic, on the other hand, Paul set forth his doctrine in opposition to the legalistic system of the Judaizers. These Judaizers insisted that Paul's Gentile converts to Christianity must not only have faith in Christ to be saved but must also be circumcised and keep the Jewish law. Paul stoutly insisted that this would mean the perversion of the whole gospel order; that faith and faith alone saved from sin; that the Christian was free from all bonds of legalism for salvation. We are justified by faith apart from works of law.[3]

(4) The Roman Catholic doctrine of justification. One reason why Protestant theology has made such a sharp distinction between justification and regeneration was that it was trying to avoid the mistake of Roman Catholicism which identifies justification and sanctification[4]

[1]Rom. 5: 18.
[2]John 5: 24.
[3]Rom. 3: 28.
[4]That is, sanctification in the sense of the progressive attainment of righteousness.

and says in substance that one is accepted of God only to the extent that he become actually righteous. So it holds that justification is not something complete once for all at the beginning of the Christian life but something gradual and progressive. This idea Protestantism rightly rejected, saying that it makes the ground of our acceptance a goodness to be cultivated in the sinner and hence denies in principle the doctrine of salvation by grace. As a result of its position on this point Romanism has no doctrine of assurance but rather holds that for one to claim assurance of acceptance with God is dangerous and presumptuous.

Over against the Roman doctrine Protestanism developed its doctrine of justification in which it held that the ground of justification was nothing in the sinner himself. Justification, it held, was the imputation to the sinner of the righteousness of Christ. And perhaps moved by a desire to make it perfectly clear that the ground of the sinner's justification was Christ rather than any goodness in himself, it emphasized the distinction between justification and regeneration. Protestant theology was so afraid the sinner's change of heart or his own goodness might be made the ground of his justification that it thought that justification and regeneration must be kept distinct if not disjoined.

(5) Justification and regeneration. Now what we insist on is not that justification and regeneration are identical but that they are inseparably connected; that they are two aspects of the same transaction. God does not justify the sinner and then regenerate him; nor does he regenerate him and then justify him. But we hold that the act of justification is a regenerating transaction. When a man is brought into right relations with God, that means a transaction in which his moral nature is renewed. Man's relationship to God is not one thing and his moral nature another. He has no moral nature

apart from his relationship to God. Bringing a man into a new standing with God renews him through and through, revolutionizes his whole being morally and spiritually.

That justification and regeneration are not separate transactions is testified to by Christian experience. One is not conscious, in becoming a Christian, of two transactions, one in which he is acquitted of guilt or justified, and another in which he is renewed in his moral nature or regenerated. But he is conscious that in being justified from sin he is made a new creature in Christ Jesus.

This is far from the Romanist position that one is justified only to the extent that he is sanctified. In Paul's doctrine there is no danger of making one's own righteousness the ground of one's acceptance with God. On the other hand, it is the fact that our justification is conditioned upon faith in Christ that makes it a regenerative transaction. When one comes to see that his salvation is dependent on Christ and what Christ has done for him and then puts his trust in Christ for salvation, it takes any spirit of self-righteousness or legalism out of one. It takes one entirely up out of himself and makes him altruistic in spirit. The fact that justification is by faith guarantees, then, that this doctrine is the only basis upon which a righteous life can be built.

(6) Summary of the values of the doctrine. We may sum the matter up, then, by saying that the doctrine of justification by faith, and this doctrine alone, has the following values in the religious life.

a. It gives one assurance of acceptance once for all with a holy God. This it does because it recognizes that the sinner's acceptance with God is on the ground of Christ's redemptive work. The sinner puts his trust in Christ and his blood for acceptance with God. Since Christ's offering was complete, made once for all, the sinner has assurance of a permanent, once-for-all acceptance with a God of righteousness,

b. Since it gives this assurance of acceptance with God on the basis of the redeeming work of Christ, it brings spiritual peace, joy and freedom.[1] It is, therefore, the only doctrine that can meet legalism. It gives freedom from the law method of salvation and sets the spirit free to serve God in love and joy. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.[2] That is, Christ puts an end to the law method of obtaining righteousness and brings in the method of faith. Therefore slavish fear is supplanted by filial trust. The old Jewish method of trying to earn righteousness with God is nullified, put out of business, by Jesus Christ, and, therefore, the bondage of the letter is supplanted by the freedom of the spirit. If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed!

c. The doctrine of justification by faith is the only basis upon which righteous men and women can be developed. As long as men try to earn salvation, their lives will be slavish and self-centered. But faith in Christ with reference to our acceptance with God, takes us up out of our selfishness and faces us out to serve God and men.

3. In Christ we are reconciled to God. This is another term used by Paul to denote God's act of saving the sinner. This term means practically the same as justification. It views sin as causing an alienation or estrangement between God and man. When this alienation is removed the sinner is said to be reconciled to God.

That reconciliation is synonymous with justification is seen in Rom. 5: 9, 10. In vs. 9 Paul speaks of being justified in the blood of Jesus; in vs. 10 he speaks of being reconciled to God through the death of his Son. It is clear that these two expressions refer to the same experience. Paul's statement in 2 Cor. 5: 19 shows the

[1]See Rom. 5: 1ff. [2]Rom. 10: 4.

same thing, for he defines reconciliation as being the non-imputation of trespasses.

A question that arises in regard to reconciliation is whether man's reconciliation to God consists in the removal of man's enmity toward God, or whether it is the removal of God's displeasure toward man, or whether it is both. It has been argued that since the reconciliation is always spoken of as man's reconciliation to God and never as God's reconciliation to man it means the removal of man's enmity toward God and not the removal of God's displeasure toward man. But the two passages above referred to as showing that reconciliation and justification are synonymous would show that this interpretation of the matter is wrong. If reconciliation is synonymous with justification or the non-imputation of sin, then it involves a change in God's attitude toward man. The same thing can be shown in another way. In Rom. 5: 10 Paul speaks of our being reconciled to God as enemies. What is meant by our being enemies? If we can find the answer to that question, it will help us to answer the question as to what takes place when we are reconciled to God. Does Paul mean by our being enemies to God that we are at enmity with God or does he mean also that God condemns us? Fortunately we have another use of this term in the same letter that will answer that question. It is in 11: 28. Speaking of Israel he says: "As touching the gospel, they are enemies for your sake; but as touching election they are beloved for the father's sake." Here their being enemies is set over against their being beloved. And since their being beloved clearly describes God's attitude toward Israel, the former term could not be limited to Israel's attitude toward God. In Rom. 5: 10 when Paul speaks of the enemies of God being reconciled, he does not mean by enemies merely those who have enmity toward God but he means those who are condemned of God. For these enemies to be reconciled

to God, then, means the removal of God's displeasure as well as the removal of man's enmity toward God. There is a statement from Jesus that shows the same thing. It is found in Matt. 5: 23, 24. Jesus says that, if one brings his gift to the altar and there remembers that his brother has aught against him, he shall leave his gift before the altar, go and be reconciled to his brother. Note that his brother has something against him, but Jesus says he is to be reconciled to his brother. For him to be reconciled to his brother means to remove his brother's enmity, not simply to dismiss his own. So for the sinner to be reconciled to God means that the sinner shall receive the pardoning grace of God. Doubtless it is meant to describe a mutual transaction, but the emphasis seems to be on the removal of God's displeasure in the non-imputation of sin.

4. In Christ we are adopted into the family of God. The term adoption seems to be used in three senses or rather with reference to three different applications. In Rom. 9: 4 Paul uses it with reference to Israel as a nation in her peculiar relation to Jehovah. In Rom. 8: 23 he uses it with reference to the redemption of the body in the resurrection for which the Christian anxiously waits. But the usual application of the term is with reference to our being made God's children spiritually when we become Christians. The term is a forensic term, as justification is, and denotes the act by which one not naturally a child is made legally the child and heir of the one who adopts him. The term, however, is not to be taken as describing a merely legalistic transaction. Paul in Rom. 8: 15 and Gal. 4: 5 emphasizes the conscious possession of the Spirit in connection with our adoption or as a consequence of it, and shows that by this conscious possession of the Spirit we are delivered from the bondage of fear and of legalism. He also points out the fact that as a consequence of our adoption, we not only are made sons of God but also

heirs and, therefore, inherit with Christ all the spiritual riches of God.

It is evident that this term is, on one side, synonymous with justification, and, on the other, with regeneration. It is a legal term like justification used to describe what God does for us in saving us. Justification emphasizes the removal of the condemnation of sin; adoption emphasizes our new standing as sons in relation to God. Like regeneration it puts our salvation in terms of sonship—adoption being the legal term, regeneration the experiential or biological term. The two ideas are so closely related that we will not dwell on adoption here but will pass on to discuss regeneration.

5. In Christ we have new life.

(1) Some New Testament terms used for this idea. One of the most common terms used in theology and in preaching to describe God's saving act is the term regeneration. The term means to beget or generate again. Our term new birth means practically the same. The term regeneration has passed into religious terminology mainly from the influence of the expression of Jesus in John 3: 3, 7, where he speaks of being begotten or born again or more properly from above. Peter uses the same verb (compounded with a preposition) in 1 Pet. 1: 3, 23. There are other terms in the New Testament used to describe this experience of being renewed in the grace of God. One is Paul's figure of a new creation. In 2 Cor. 5: 17, he says: "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature" (literally "there is a new creation"). Here the apostle describes this saving act on God's part as being a creative act in which he so renews one that "the old things are passed away: behold, they are become new." He says in Gal. 6: 15: "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature" (literally creation). In Eph. 2: 10, 15; 4: 24; Col. 3: 10, he uses the same figure. In Rom. 2: 29 Paul says that true circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the

letter. This evidently refers to regeneration as that which makes one a member of the true spiritual Israel. Another figure found in Paul's writings and in some other places is that of death and resurrection. In Rom. 6: 1ff Paul sets forth the idea that the Christian is one who has died to sin and risen to walk in newness of life. This death to sin was set forth further back as meaning repentance. That is true. To die to sin is to repent if we look at it as a human act; if we look at it from the point of view of the divine efficiency it is equivalent to regeneration. In Gal. 2: 20 Paul says: "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." In Gal. 6: 14, he glories in the cross through which the world has been crucified to him and he to the world.[1] This reminds us of the saying of Jesus that, if any man would come after him, he must deny himself and take up his cross. One shall lose his life by saving it and save it by losing it.[2] "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit."[3] "The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live."[4]

(2) The need of regeneration. The necessity of regeneration has been shown in a general way in our discussion of the doctrine of sin. It is usually said that the guilt of sin necessitates justification, while the depravity of sin necessitates regeneration and sanctification. Accepting this statement of the case as true, let us look a little more carefully at Scripture teaching in regard to the matter, remembering, as previously stated, that justification and regeneration are not to be separated as two things but two phases of one saving transaction.

In studying the doctrine of sin we saw that sin was universal and that man was helpless in its power. In

[1]See also Gal. 5: 24 and Col. 2: 20.
[2]Matt. 16: 24, 25.
[3]John 12: 24.
[4]John 5: 25.

this sense man is totally depraved. He is entirely helpless in the power of sin unless and until delivered by the grace of God. If we look at the ethical and religious standard set up for men by Jesus, we see at once the necessity for regeneration. His standard was a high standard. If men get into the kingdom of heaven, they must have a righteousness exceeding that of the scribes and Pharisees.[1] The righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees was external and legalistic. Jesus demanded a righteousness that was inner—a righteousness of motive, purity of heart as well as of outward life.[2] The regenerating grace of God is the only thing that can give men the graces of character demanded in the Sermon on the Mount of those who are to be citizens of the kingdom. Jesus said that we should be perfect as the Father in heaven is perfect.[3] He recognized the law as demanding love to God with all the powers of one's being and love to one's neighbor as one loves himself.[4] Such a standard brings only despair unless one is given some spiritual dynamic other than is to be found in the natural man.

The necessity of regeneration comes out clearly in Paul's discussion of the power of sin in human life. This is shown in the sixth and seventh chapters of Romans, especially the seventh in which he gives a chapter out of his own spiritual experience. He describes his state of unconsciousness of condemnation (vs. 9a), his awakening to a knowledge of the demands of the law and his sense of condemnation and death that followed (vs. 9b-11), his efforts to break the power of sin (vs. 15ff), and finally his despairing cry for help (vs. 24). Then comes his triumphant victory in Christ Jesus (vs. 25). In the eighth chapter he says that the law (rule or dominion) of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus freed him from the law (rule or dominion) of sin and death (vs. 2). The

[1]Matt. 5: 20.
[2]Matt. 5: 21ff.
[3]Matt. 5: 48.
[4]Luke 10: 25ff.

thing that the law could not do has now been done; sin has been condemned in the flesh; that is, its power has been broken by the incoming of a power superior to the power of sin, namely, the power of a new life in Christ Jesus (vs. 3). Nothing short of the incoming of this new life would do. The old man could not be cultivated into submission to the will of God. "For they that are after the flesh mind the things of the flesh" (vs. 5). "The mind of the flesh is death" (vs. 6). "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be; and they that are in the flesh can not please God" (vs. 7, 8). Some have thought that Paul's statements here are unduly dark and pessimistic. They have charged it up to his Pharisaism and have tried to leave out this dark picture of the sinfulness and helplessness of the natural man as not belonging to Paul's best Christian thought. But this account shows that this doctrine is not simply the remains of Paul's Pharisaic dogmatism but grew up out of his own experience under the law and under grace. When he states how the carnal mind is set against God and can bring only condemnation and death, he is only telling us what he knows from his own experience.

(3) The nature of the change. What kind of a change is regeneration? Just what is it that takes place when a man is born again?

a. Some one might say that there is no use to discuss that question, for the change is a mysterious one and, therefore, can not be understood. So, it may be said, what is the use to try to understand it?

Can regeneration be understood? No, not entirely. It is a mystery, but so is most everything else we deal with. Jesus told Nicodemus that it was like the wind—as much as to say that the blowing of the wind was as much a mystery as regeneration, yet we know that it blows. So it is with the commonest facts and experiences of life. Matter is mysterious, mind is mysterious,

will is mysterious, love is mysterious. Yet we know something about all of these. But we do not know all about any of them. Regeneration is a fact of experience, and we know something about it as a fact of experience, just as we may know any of the other realities mentioned.

In seeking to understand what kind of a change regeneration is there are two sources of information open to us, each of which is essential to the end in view. One is the New Testament teaching in regard to the matter; the other is experience, our own and others' whose testimony is available for us. We have seen that the New Testament uses a variety of expressions to describe this transaction; most or all of them analogies drawn from other realms of life and experience to try to set forth the nature of this transaction. The very fact that so many different terms are used is evidence that we are dealing with an experience whose fundamental significance it is difficult to set forth. Yet by a study of these, especially in the light of our own experiences of the regenerating power of God's grace, we can know something of the nature and significance of this experience.

Certainly one would not be justified in assuming either of two attitudes in regard to the matter. One is to say that, since it is mysterious, there is no use to try to find out anything about it. That would be equivalent to saying that, because we can not know all about it, therefore, there is no use to try to find out anything about it. To affirm that it is mysterious is to say that we know something about it. To know that there are limits to what we can know is worth something. The other attitude we should not assume is the attitude of rejecting the idea because we can not fully understand it. If we are going to accept only that which we understand fully, how much will we accept? Our creed would be brief indeed on that kind of a basis. We would not

believe in our own existence for that is manifestly a very mysterious thing. Yet we accept the fact whether we can fathom the depths of its significance or not.

b. This change is primarily of the nature of a moral and spiritual renewal. It is a change the main significance of which is to be found in the realm of character. In this change the fundamental moral disposition is changed. The affections and activities of life no longer center in self, but in God. Love for God and for one's fellows becomes the controlling factor in life. One dies to sin and rises to walk in newness of life.[1]

It is difficult for some to keep from thinking of regeneration as the addition of some kind of substance, or some new faculty to one's being. The "new creation,"[2] the "new life" that never perishes,[3] the "divine nature" of which we are made partakers[4]—all of these, they think, must signify the addition of a new metaphysical element or substance to one's being, and not a "mere" change in moral disposition. Dr. Strong seems almost to think of the matter thus, when he speaks of our sharing in a new humanity, of which Christ is the head.[5] But let it be said that there is nothing that could happen to any man of more fundamental and far-reaching significance than a change in moral disposition. This is truly a new creation. It is of such tremendous significance that Paul can say because of it that old things are passed away; they are become new.[6]

A true philosophy is coming to see that the fundamental concept in regard to reality is not "substance," but personality. And the most meaningful thing about personality is the moral quality of the person, the question of character. A certain type of non-evangelical theology has taken for its solgan in recent years "salvation by character," meaning by this the development of char-

[1]Rom. 6: 1ff.
[2]2 Cor. 5: 17.
[3]John 5: 21, *et al.*
[4]2 Pet. 1: 4.
[5]See "Sys. Theol.," section on regeneration.
[6]2 Cor. 5: 17.

acter within and on one's self rather than dependence on the "merits" or "imputed righteousness" of another. This "new theology" is right in its insistence on the idea that there can be no salvation apart from character. There can be no salvation for man other than actually making him righteous. And to the extent that a one-sided orthodox Protestantism has talked about being saved by an "imputed righteousness" apart from any righteousness of our own, as if we did not need to be made righteous, but could go to heaven on a righteousness transferred to our credit by a mere trick of book-keeping—to the extent that it has meant that or made the impression that it meant that, to that extent has it deserved the scorn of all minds of any ethical perception or seriousness. A justification that meant no more than that would indeed give one only a "fictitious righteousness." But to save one is to make him righteous, and one is not saved except as, and to the extent that, he is made righteous. But there can be no genuine and permanent righteousness apart from the grace of God manifested in Jesus Christ. The grace of God embodied and made available for us in Jesus Christ is the fact of fundamental significance for us. As long as one fails to find and appropriate God savingly revealed in Christ, he misses the way of righteousness and truth. Now regeneration is a transaction in which the moral nature is so changed that one can never again rest in a life of sin. Righteousness becomes the passion of the soul. This does not mean that all evil or sinful propensities are at a stroke eliminated from one's being; but it does mean that such a revolutionary transaction has taken place in the soul that it can never rest until it is free from sin. The dominant passion of the soul becomes love for righteousness and hatred for sin. In principle the soul is made sinless. This is why the man that is begotten of God cannot sin. He cannot live in sin as his natural and native element as formerly he did; he cannot habitually

sin, cannot continually sin; he cannot live a life of sin.[1]

c. This change is one that is wrought in the moral nature of man by the Spirit of God. Nothing but divine power could produce the change. Both experience and Scripture bear testimony to this. It is a new creation in which old things pass away and all things are made new.[2] It is a birth from above in which one is cleansed (born of water) and given a spiritual disposition (born of the Spirit).[3] It is a change that is not of blood (natural descent), nor of the will of man (human nature on its higher, spiritual side), nor of the will of the flesh (human nature on its lower side), but of God.[4] God's power works this change. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation.[5] God draws men to Christ.[6] The Spirit convicts of sin.[7] This was manifested on the day of Pentecost. It was after the Spirit came that men hearing the gospel were pricked in their hearts and cried out, saying, "What shall we do?"[8] All through the Acts and epistles we find that it was the Lord who wrought with the disciples to save. No man can call Jesus Lord except in the Holy Spirit.[9] Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God must give the increase.[10] It is unto God that salvation is ascribed in the book of Revelation.[11]

Christian experience bears witness to the same truth. The man who experiences regeneration knows as well as he knows daylight from darkness that he himself did not work the change. He submitted to God, and God changed him. He knows the power that deals with him as something new in his experience. He knows it as some power different and higher in nature than the social forces that influence his life. It is the spontaneous impulse of the Christian heart to thank God for one's own salvation or for the salvation of another.

[1]1 John 3: 6-9.
[2]2 Cor. 5: 17.
[3]John 3: 3ff.
[4]John 1: 12.
[5]Rom. 1: 16.
[6]John 6: 44.
[7]John 16: 8-11.
[8]Acts 2: 37.
[9]1 Cor. 12: 3.
[10]1 Cor. 3: 6.
[11]12: 10, *et al.*

d. The divine Spirit regenerates us by reproducing in us the moral and spiritual image of Jesus Christ. The thing that God had in mind for us in predestinating us to salvation is that we shall be made like Jesus Christ.[1] It is in Christ that we were chosen before the foundation of the world.[2] We do not know yet what our eternal destiny is to be, but we do know that when Christ shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.[3] In regeneration one is crucified with Christ. The old man dies and Christ comes to live in us. By faith we are so united to him that he becomes the inner motive power and dominant passion of our lives.[4] This was so true of Paul that he could say of himself, "To me to live is Christ."[5] We are sometimes tempted to think of the saving work of the Spirit as being detached and unrelated to the person and work of Christ. This is a mistake. The Spirit came to bear witness to Christ.[6] He regenerates us by making Christ to dwell in us the hope of glory.[7]

e. This shows that, while it is the Spirit that regenerates us, ordinarily at least the Spirit uses means in renewing us. It is by the word of God that we are begotten again.[8] Perhaps it would be going too far to say that God could not regenerate a man without the use of ordinary gospel agencies, yet we certainly are safe in saying that this is his usual way. We need not be dogmatic in limiting God to the use of such means. We can allow the infinite One some liberty to work in ways that we do not comprehend or know of. Yet when that is said, perhaps we are still warranted in saying that God regenerates, at least as a distinct experience such as brings one into conscious fellowship with God, only by using gospel agencies that give one a knowledge of Jesus Christ as Savior. This is necessary because man is a ra-

[1]Rom. 8: 29.
[2]Eph. 1: 4.
[3]1 John 3: 2.
[4]See Gal. 2: 20.
[5]Phil. 1: 21.
[6]John 15: 26; Acts 5: 32.
[7]Col. 1: 27.
[8]1 Peter 1: 23.

tional being. He is not saved in some magical way that has no relation to his rational and moral nature, but by coming into conscious fellowship with Christ. This is the point of what one might call Paul's philosophy of missions in Rom. 10: 12ff.

f. This carries with it the idea that man is regenerated by faith. Through faith are we the sons of God.[1] To as many as received him gave he the right to become the children of God.[2] Faith is a regenerative act, because it brings one into union with God as revealed in Christ.

There has been an age-long debate between Calvinism and Arminianism as to which precedes, faith or regeneration. Calvinism has said that regeneration as God's quickening act must be first, because a dead man cannot act. An unholy man cannot perform a holy act. Then, it is said, to hold that man exercises faith before being quickened into life would be to hold that man within and of himself does something that brings the favor of God, and that cannot be allowed. On the other hand, those who hold the other position say that, if one is regenerated before he exercises faith, then man is saved without his own consent and God deals with him as a thing and not as a person.

We are sometimes told that we are not to think of either of these as coming ahead of the other in point of time, but that one precedes the other logically. The Calvinst says that logically regeneration must precede, since God's power is the cause of man's act; so God's quickening activity causes man's response in an act of faith. The Arminian, however, says that faith logically precedes, since faith is the condition of salvation. It is barely possible that each is right. Looked at in one way, faith may logically precede; looked at in another, the quickening power of God may precede. A more accurate way of expressing it is to say that faith and regeneration imply each other; they are inseparable; they are two aspects of one spiritual experience.

[1]Gal. 3: 26. [2]John 1: 12.

We must remember that we cannot have one without the other. You could not have a believer who was unregenerate, nor a regenerated man who was not a believer. The Calvinist is right in insisting that the power of God must regenerate and that man cannot within and of himself believe. God must produce faith in his heart. On the other hand, it is true that men are regenerated by faith. By faith we become the children of God. God regenerates. But he does not regenerate irrespective of man's faith. He regenerates by producing faith in man's heart. And regeneration is not complete until man exercises faith. In the act of faith on man's part regeneration is completed. So the question as to which precedes, regeneration or faith, becomes a meaningless question.

g. What has been said in the last few paragraphs will help to answer another question; namely, whether regeneration takes place in the conscious or the subconscious region of man's personality. Some hold that regeneration takes place in the subconscious mind. The discussions of Mr. William James[1] on the question of religion favor this view. Dr. Strong[2] states it very definitely in his theology. He says that regeneration takes place in the subconscious region of personality and is known only in its results. This falls in with the Calvinistic position that regeneration precedes repentance and faith, and is open to the same objections. If regeneration takes place in the subconscious region of personality and is known only by its results, then regeneration would hardly be a transaction on the moral plane, but would be a sub-normal transaction. In favor of the view is the suddenness of some conversions and the mysteriousness of the change. But while conversion is sometimes sudden, it is doubtful if there can be found a case in which there were not definite influences leading up to it. It is true that there is an element of mystery, a depth to the

[1] See "Varieties of Religious Experience."

[2] See "Sys. Theol.," section on regeneration.

experience that we cannot fathom; yet it is not a magical, irrational, non-moral transaction. It is a transaction in which man is in possession of his faculties, and it is never complete at least until one consciously and freely surrenders to Christ as Savior and Lord. This is a conscious transaction.

6. In Christ we are sanctified.

(1) Meaning of the term. It is customary at this point in treatises on theology to discuss the doctrine of "sanctification." This term, we are told, is used in the Bible in a twofold sense. It means, first of all, consecration or dedication to God. This use is frequent in the Old Testament and is not unknown in the New. Used in this sense it included things as well as persons and did not possess moral significance. The temple, the altar, the city of Jerusalem—anything connected in a special way with Jehovah and his service—were spoken of as holy. We speak to-day of the holy land, the holy city, holy days, and so on. But the words holy and holiness did come to have ethical significance in the Old Testament. So do the terms sanctify and sanctification in the New Testament. Things are sanctified as they are consecrated to God, as they are regarded and treated as sacred or dedicated to the divine service. But since the character of God was regarded as ethically righteous, it was recognized that men who are acceptable for his service must be also righteous in character. This thought is given great emphasis in places in the Old Testament, especially in the psalms and the prophets. And when applied to persons in the New Testament, the idea is fundamentally ethical. The thing that makes sanctification necessary is man's lack of righteousness or his sin. The term is used in the New Testament both for the initiation of the Christian life and for its development. The New Testament speaks of all Christians as "saints" or "sanctified ones."[1] In this

[1]Acts 9: 13; Rom. 1: 7; 1 Cor. 1: 2; 2 Cor. 1: 1; Eph. 1: 1; Phil. 1: 1; Col. 1: 2.

sense the term is synonymous with justification or regeneration. This is sometimes called positional sanctification, as distinguished from progressive sanctification. Then it is used with reference to the progressive cleansing or purification of the soul.[2] It is in this sense that the term is usually used in discussion in systems of theology. But there are very few places in the New Testament where the term is unquestionably used in the sense of a progressive work. The preponderating use of the term is in its appliaction to a definite act at the beginning of the Christian life.

(2) All Christians sanctified. Every Christian, then, however imperfect he may be, is sanctified in the sense that he is dedicated or consecrated to God by the power of the Spirit and by his own act of faith. We have seen that one element in faith is surrender to Christ as Lord. Faith is thus an act of dedication. One dedicates himself to God and separates himself from all that opposes his consecration to God. There should be, normally there will be, a deepening consecration to God and his service, and a more complete separation of oneself from all the forces and factors of life that hinder this consecration; but this is only the carrying out of what was involved in that first act of consecration.

Every Christian is sanctified also in the sense of an inner purification or transformation of character. In this sense sanctification means about the same as regeneration. One who is dedicated to a God of love and righteousness will necessarily become like him in character. The thing that renews one in heart and character is the fact that he is dedicated by an act of self-surrender to a righteous God. Fellowship with a holy God produces holiness in man. Here again there should be progressive sanctification; but the prevailing use of the term in the New Testament is in the sense of the initial dedication or cleansing from sin.

[2] 1 Thess. 5: 23; Heb. 12: 14.

IV. **The consciousness of salvation.** One of the outstanding things about salvation in the Christian sense of the term is that it is a conscious transaction. This was presupposed in all that has been said about salvation, but it is well now to give special consideration to it.

1. The normal Christian experience. The normal Christian experience is one in which the Christian has conscious acceptance with God. The whole religious atmosphere seems to change with the coming of Jesus. Old Testament saints had conscious communion with God, but they did not have that full note of joy and confidence in their relation with God that we find in the New Testament. Especially is it true from Pentecost on, that men had this full assurance of acceptance with God. Forgiveness of sins was no merely external transaction that the forgiven sinner might happen to hear about or not.

(1) In the first place, there was the consciousness of sin. This was produced by the preaching of the gospel. The man who had no consciousness of sin and in whom it could not be produced by the word of God was hopeless. The bigger sinner is not always more conscious of his sins, but the more one is conscious of sin, the more is he likely to rejoice in salvation and love the God who forgives in mercy.[1]

(2) Salvation from sin was a transaction in which one was brought into conscious communion with God. In this transaction one finds God. He comes to know God.[2] God comes to possess man and man to possess God. He shall be their God and they shall be his people.[3] In a real sense a man has no God until he comes to possess him in this great revolutionary crisis of life. In this crisis a covenant is sealed by which the soul becomes consciously given over to him. When sin was removed and the soul came into fellowship with God, the soul was

[1]Luke 7: 41ff.
[2]John 17: 3.
[3]Heb. 8: 10.

often flooded with joy.[1] The justified man had a heritage of peace to which he was entitled by virtue of his new relation with God.[2] Another element that came as a result of this fellowship with God in Christ was hope.[3] New Testament Christians were forward looking.

This does not mean that all Christian experiences were alike then any more than they are now. Some were more emotional and cataclysmic than others. Lydia did not seem to have the agitation of soul that the jailer had.[4] There are varieties of Christian experience, just as there are differences among men in every other respect. But every normal Christian experience is an experience of conscious acceptance with God in the forgiveness of sins, an experience that brings love, joy, peace and hope to the soul.

2. The lack of assurance. Yet it must be recognized that there are cases of those who have been regenerated who do not have clear and definite consciousness of acceptance with God. This is recognized in the New Testament and is verified in Christian experience. John says that he wrote his Gospel that men might have life by believing in Jesus as the Christ.[5] He says he wrote the First Epistle in order that those who believe may know that they have eternal life.[6] This clearly implies two things. One is that it is the privilege of a saved man to know that he is saved. The other is that a man may be saved and not have this assurance. If salvation and assurance were inseparable, then John's writing of the Epistle was in vain; he was in that case writing to bring to Christians something that they could not be Christians and not have.

Sometimes assurance is lacking in the beginning of the Christian life; sometimes one may have it and lose it. Sometimes the lack of assurance is caused by sin and disobedience in the life; sometimes it is due to a lack of

[1]See Acts 8: 8; 13: 52, *et al.* [3]See Rom. 8: 24. [5]John 20: 31.
[2]Rom. 5: 1. [4]See Acts 16. [6]1 John 5: 13.

understanding of some of the fundamental and elemental things in the Christian life, such as the ground of our forgiveness in the atoning work of Christ, or faith as the essential and all-inclusive condition of salvation. In some cases, the lack of assurance is caused by the fact that one did not get just the kind of experience he was looking for. Some people want the kind of religious experience Paul had, and, therefore, are constantly dissatisfied with the one God has given them. In still other cases, lack of assurance is due to intellectual perplexities. One may be disturbed because he cannot work out to his own satisfaction all the problems concerning God and his dealings with man.

3. What is necessary to assurance. A word might be said now as to how assurance is produced or what is necessary to assurance.

In the first place, one needs a clear understanding and a firm grasp of the elemental things in salvation. This is not so say that he needs to be an expert theologian. He does not. Nor is it to say with the Catholic creeds that, if he does not believe certain dogmas, he shall be anathema. But he does need a firm grasp on the fact that Christ has made full provision for our sins and that we are saved by faith in him. There can be no definite assurance of salvation where one does not definitely grasp this fact. Sometimes one may know that he has been changed without having a clear consciousness of salvation, but this clear consciousness of salvation will come when one firmly grasps the fact that it is faith in the crucified and risen Redeemer that saves. Along with this there must be definite surrender to Christ as Lord. The will must be surrendered to him. There must be no conscious and wilful disobedience to Christ.

Putting together what has been said, it will be seen that the sum of it is that one must have clear and definite faith to have assurance of acceptance with God. Faith brings its own assurance. And nothing but faith is necessary.

Dr. Strong says: "The ground of faith (meaning saving faith) is the external word of promise. The ground of assurance, on the other hand, is the inward witness of the Spirit that we fulfill the conditions of the promise."[1] This statement is somewhat misleading. It makes the impression that the ground of saving faith is one thing, and that the ground of the faith that brings assurance is another thing. But this is a mistake. The faith that saves is the faith that assures. Saving faith carries its own assurance, and, if it does not, it is because the faith is not clear and definite. So, if one needs assurance, he will not get it by having developed in him a new kind of faith or faith in a different object. Assurance will come when faith is clarified, strengthened and aware of what it is about. Christ is always the object of faith, and the Holy Spirit always is the power that produces faith in Christ. This is true both in salvation and assurance. In other words, Christ and the Holy Spirit both bear the same relation to saving faith that they do to assuring faith, for these are one faith, not two.[2]

There are pointed out in the New Testament certain ethical and spiritual qualities that mark the regenerated man. Some of these are the possession of the Spirit,[3] obedience to Christ or God,[4] a life of righteousness and of victory over sin,[5] love of the brotherhood,[6] the power to discern the truth.[7] These are all the result of our faith in Christ. When we are asked to look at these as evidences of regeneration, we are simply asked to let our faith become clear and self-conscious and know what it is about. We are not asked to take something outside of or beyond saving faith as evidence of our salvation.

[1]"Sys. Theol.," Vol. III, p. 844.
[2]Cf. on the work of the Spirit, pp. 245, 246.
[3]Rom. 8: 9, 14; 1 John 3: 24.
[4]John 14: 15, 21; 1 John 2: 34.
[5]1 John 3: 6-9.
[6]1 John 3: 10ff.
[7]1 John 2: 27.

CHAPTER IV

THE NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

I. The Christian's mission and work.
   1. To work out and exemplify the life implanted in regeneration.
   2. To bring others into saving relations with Christ and develop the new life in them.
   3. To seek to make the will of God regnant in the whole of human life.

II. Providence.
   1. Providence and redemption.
   2. Providence and faith.

III. Prayer.
   1. Elements in prayer.
      (1) Prayer as communion with God.
      (2) Specific elements in prayer.
         a. Adoration.
         b. Thanksgiving.
         c. Petition.
         d. Intercession.
   2. The purpose and scope of prayer.
      (1) Purpose—to adjust man's relations with God.
      (2) Scope—anything that concerns man.
      (3) Prayer a means of effecting God's purpose of good concerning man.
   3. Objections and difficulties in regard to prayer.
      (1) Does prayer change the will of God?
         Answer: It does not change his ultimate purpose or plan, but he plans to do things in response to man's prayer.
      (2) Does not God's foreknowledge exclude prayer and its answer?
         Answer: God foreknows all things, including man's prayer and his own answer.

(3) Prayer would interfere with the order of nature.
Answer: No more so than any other of man's free activities in relation to nature.
(4) Best answer to difficulties is the answer of experience.
4. Conditions of answer to prayer.
(1) Prayer as communion involves a response on God's part.
(2) God does not always give the things we ask for.
(3) Right spiritual attitude necessary in communion.

IV. The persistence of the Christian life.
1. Meaning of "final perseverance of the saints."
2. Proof that the regenerated will persevere.
(1) Doctrine of election.
(2) Completeness of atonement.
(3) Justification.
(4) "Eternal" life.
(5) Union with Christ.
(6) Christ's intercession.
(7) "Sealing" of the Spirit.
(8) Definite statements in New Testament.
3. Objections to the doctrine.
(1) That it is inconsistent with freedom of man.
Answer:
Freedom not inconsistent with fixity of character.
(2) That it encourages one to a life of sin.
Answer:
Assurance of victory not an incentive to quit fighting.
(3) That the Bible teaches "falling from grace."
Answer:
a. Some passages teach that perseverance is necessary to final salvation.
b. Some that perseverance is an evidence of regeneration.
c. Some that those not persevering are "false professors."
d. Some emphasize lack of development and loss of reward.
e. Some emphasize danger of rejecting gospel truth.

V. The growth of the Christian life.
1. The need of growth.
2. Foes to growth.
3. The means of growth.
4. The condition of growth.
5. The perfection theory of growth.
6. The goal of growth.

Having seen something of how the Christian life begins in an act of faith on man's part and an act of forgiveness and regeneration on God's part, in which the sinner is brought into conscious fellowship with God and renewed in the moral image of Jesus Christ, let us turn our attention now to the life that the Christian lives in pursuance of this act of faith and in fulfillment and completion of God's saving act. It is our purpose in this chapter to consider only some of the outstanding and more important phases of this life.

I. **The Christian's mission and work.** To discuss in full the Christian's mission and work would necessitate the treatment of several of the phases of practical theology. This would manifestly be out of order here. What we are concerned with is simply to consider briefly some of the fundamental principles of that life, especially when it is viewed as a life of redemption.

1. The first thing that we mention is that the Christian's mission is to work out and exemplify in his daily activities the life implanted in his heart when he becomes a Christian. This life seeks embodiment and expression. This is expressed in many ways in the New Testament. The Christian is said to follow Christ.[1] He is a disciple; that is, a learner in the school of Chrst.[2] The Spirit of Christ is in him and he is led by that Spirit.[3] Christ lives in him[4] and he strives to bring every thought into subjection to Christ.[5] He is to work out his salvation, because it is God that works in him both to will and to do.[6] We are not meaning to say here that the Christian life is simply the embodiment of some principle of divine life implanted at the time of regeneration which lives on independently of further re-enforcement from the divine presence. God continues to work in us, as the above references show. He continues to energize in us and through us, and our mission is to work down

[1]Mark 1: 16ff; 2: 14. [2]Matt. 28: 19. [3]Rom. 8: 9ff, 14. [4]Gal. 2: 20. [5]2 Cor. 10: 5. [6]Phil. 2: 12, 13.

and out to the limit what God works in us in the way of willing and doing.

2. The Christian's mission, in another phase of it, is to bring others into saving relations with Christ and develop the Christ-life in them. Every Christian should be an evangelist, a herald of good news. In this sense every Christian should be a preacher. This is the spontaneous impulse of the new life in us—to bring somebody else to know Christ and enjoy the great blessing that he brings. Our mission is to bear witness to him from Jerusalem to the uttermost part of the earth. Any form of Christianity that does not have throbbing through it a mighty missionary and evangelistic impulse is a degenerated form. And the Christian's mission is to do all he can to develop the Christ-life in others after they are brought into saving relation with him.

3. The Christian's mission is to do all the good he can in every realm of life, in every possible way. He is to seek to make regnant the will of God in the whole extent of human life and society. There are those to-day who set over against each other evangelistic effort and social service. They would disparage one in favor of the other. Those who emphasize evangelism and decry social service seem to think that anything except direct religious work is irreligious. Every good work is religious, if done with a motive to glorify God. There is no conflict between serving God and helping men. Surely the Christ who healed the bodies of men and performed a miracle to feed the hungry multitude does not represent a God who is displeased with anything that makes this world a better place in which to live. The type of piety that thinks that the only function of religion is to cause a man to withdraw into some monastery and save his own soul and let the world go to the devil—that type of piety belongs to the middle ages, if it belongs anywhere. Nor is it the only function of Christianity to save the souls of men from hell in the next life; they need to

be made righteous in every relation of life. The regeneration of the individual and the regeneration of society should never be put over against each other as antithetical things; it is not a question of one to the exclusion of the other. They are rather two things that are mutually dependent. The only way to regenerate society is through the regeneration of the individual units of society. And the only power that can regenerate the individual is the gospel of Christ. Nor has the gospel done its full work in the life of the individual unless he is made right in every relation of life. The gospel makes a man live right in the world, not withdraw from the world. Jesus taught his disciples to pray that God's kingdom might come and God's will be done on earth as it is in heaven.[1]

II. **Providence.**

1. Providence and redemption. To see life as we should we must see it as a providential order. But to understand the doctrine of providence we must see it from the point of view of redemption. This comes out clearly in Paul's statement in Rom. 8: 28, 29. The emphasis is usually laid on Paul's statement that all things work together for good to those that love God. But we must see this in the light of the following statement that God has predestinated those whom he foreknew to be conformed to the image of his Son. The apostle here shows that what God had in mind for his people was that they should be made like Jesus Christ. That was the thing he purposed for them from all eternity. It was with reference to that that he made the world and directs it. His moral government of the world is directed to that end. This world was made for the purpose of developing Christian character in it. The whole historical order is a redemptive order.

When Paul says that all things work together for good, in order to understand him we must see what the good is that he had in mind. He is not saying that all things

[1]Matt. 6: 10.

work together for our comfort or ease, for our physical health or the gathering of material wealth. There might be a better world than this one for these things, but God is not concerned primarily about these. He is concerned, first of all, that we should become like Christ. To that end he makes all things to work.

In thinking of the idea of providence we should consider it in relation to the development of the kingdom of God in the world as well as in relation to the redemption of the individual. The coming of the kingdom and the redemption of the individual are vitally interlinked. The salvation of each individual is a factor in the coming of the kingdom. The kingdom comes through the saving of individuals. In studying God's purpose of redemption we saw that it was not to be interpreted to mean that God purposed to save the individual as an isolated unit, without reference to his connections in the social and historical order to which he belongs. So we are not to take the idea of providence to mean that God works for the good of the individual without reference to his place in society or the kingdom of God. The good of the individual is a phase of the common good. The whole of Biblical history shows that God is working toward an end that includes more than the good of individuals selected out of the mass; he is working toward a universal kingdom of good as the goal of history.

Providence, then, is both general and particular. The idea of a general providence that did not include the minutest affairs and cares of life does not agree with Jesus' view of God. He says that not a sparrow falls to the ground without his notice. He clothes and feeds his people.[1] We can cast all of our anxiety upon him, realizing that he cares for us.[2] By keeping in constant communion with the Lord we can live above anxiety and have the peace of God to guard our hearts and our thoughts.[3]

[1]Matt. 6: 26ff; 10: 29ff.
[2]1 Peter 5: 7.
[3]Phil. 4: 6, 7.

2. Providence and faith. What has been said will show that God's providence is not something that works in a mechanical or necessary manner. Since the good that God is working out for us is the good of redemption, our obtaining that good is conditioned upon our faith. Redemption is not something that comes to man automatically or mechanically. Redemption is a moral and spiritual matter and is morally and spiritually conditioned. The idea of providence has been too often presented as if it meant that everything that came into our lives was within itself a good independently of our attitude toward God and his providential dealings with us. This is not true. Whether or not the things that come into our lives are a blessing to us depends on how they are received. If received in the spirit of submission and trust in God, all things work together for good. Otherwise what was intended for our good may even prove to be a curse. It is to those that love God that all things work for good, and we might safely say that all things work for good to the extent that we love God or are led to love him by the things that come to us.

The matter might be put thus: The reason that all things work together for good to the Christian is that the Christian is one in whom the dominant motive and passion of life is love to God. Since this is the dominant force in life, everything in life causes it to grow. When one is properly related to God everything in life draws one closer to him and makes one more like him in character. Love to God is the alchemy that has the power of transmuting all the baser metals of life into the pure gold of Christian character.

This shows that the New Testament does not consider all things as good within themselves. Nor does Paul say that all these things within and of themselves work for good. His statement implies that it is because of God that all things work for good. It might be translated that God works all things for good; but whether

it should be translated that way or not, that was clearly Paul's thought. The New Testament doctrine was that every detail of life, even the smallest, was under his control and he directs it all for our good.

It is God that makes all things work together for our good; and their being good to us is conditioned upon our faith and love toward him. In other words, all else becomes good to us. To the extent that one comes into fellowship with God does he overcome evil and transmute it into a means for good.

III. **Prayer.** One of the most important things in the Christian life is prayer. Prayer is elemental and fundamental. The only thing we can do here is to consider in a brief way some of the more important aspects of this subject in its vital relation to the Christian life.

1. Elements in prayer. There are a number of elements or factors that enter into prayer—one might call them varieties of prayer. In the broadest sense of the term, prayer is communion of the soul with God; that is, it is the conscious outgoing of the soul in spiritual fellowship with God. The soul reaches out in thought and aspiration after God and usually in spoken word expresses itself to him. There is also in this communion the side of waiting in an attentive and receptive attitude on God for spiritual light, strength and guidance. It is the recognition of the unseen Companion. It is taking definite and conscious recognition of God.

One of the specific elements in prayer as communion with God is adoration. It is the recognition of the worth and worthiness of his character and giving expression to this recognition. It is the proper response of the soul in worshipful recognition of the character of God as holy love.

There enters into prayer also the element of thanksgiving. Thanksgiving is the expression of our recognition of God as the source of our blessings and an acknowledgment of the fact that God's gifts to us put us under

obligations to the Giver. In adoration we are recognizing the worth of God's character; in thanksgiving we are recognizing our indebtedness to him for his blessings to us which are an expression of his goodness of character.

Petition is a prominent element in prayer. It is to be feared that with many people it is about the only factor. For some people it seems to be about all there is in prayer. It certainly should not be the only thing in prayer, but it is very naturally a prominent one. Intercession is a special form of petition. It is asking God for a blessing on someone else rather than on self. This is an outstanding feature of prayer as we have it presented in the Bible, both by precept and example. Abraham pleading for Sodom,[1] Moses for Israel,[2] Paul for the Jews,[3] are outstanding examples.

2. The purpose and scope of prayer. It has been stated that prayer is communion with God. We might ask: What is the purpose of prayer? We might say in accordance with this idea that the main purpose of prayer is the right adjustment of man's relations with God. Prayer is a matter of personal relations and adjustments. It is man as a person dealing directly with God as a person. In dealing with God man is dealing with an unseen and spiritual reality. Prayer is a recognition of the fact that this reality is a person, not simply an impersonal force or an abstract principle. Mrs. Eddy says that God is principle.[4] God is more than principle. He is a person. And prayer is direct dealing on man's part wtih this supreme spiritual power.

Where there is no recognition of the personality of God, there can be no prayer in the true sense of the word. There may be meditation, reflection, but these are not prayer. There can be no adoration, thanksgiving, petition, no personal communion of any kind. The supreme

[1]Gen. 18: 22ff.
[2]Ex. 32: 31ff; Deut. 9: 25ff.
[3]Rom. 9: 1ff; 10: 1.
[4]*Science and Health,* pp. 107, 111 112, 113, 115, etc., edition of 1913.

thing that man needs is God himself rather than something that God can give. God is himself the supreme blessing. He is man's chief need. When God gives himself he gives all else; without God nothing else meets his need.

About what should man pray? What constitutes a proper subject of prayer? The answer is: Anything that concerns man is a proper subject of prayer. This means that anything that is of concern to man is also of concern to God. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is interested in anything and everything that touches the lives of his human children. This does not mean that we can ask God for anything we want and get it. Far from it. But it does mean that in any situation, perplexed by any problem, we may bring ourselves with our problem to God, and when we find the right personal adjustment with God, he will solve or help us to solve our problem.

Prayer is not an effort on the part of man to persuade an unwilling God to bestow some good on man. Rather is it such an adjustment of man's personal relations with God as makes it possible for God to bestow a blessing he desires to bestow. It is not bringing a reluctant God into harmony with man's will; it is rather bringing man into harmony with God's will, so that God can do his highest will concerning man. This is shown in the fact that the Holy Spirit makes intercession for us. The reason for this is that we do not know how to pray as we ought.[1] The Spirit makes intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered. This intercession is not intercession apart from ours, but it is intercession in and through us. The groanings unutterable are the groanings of the human spirit possessed and moved by the divine Spirit. The Spirit moves us to pray in accordance with the divine will, and, therefore, God answers our petitions. Man cannot pray in accordance with the divine will except as he

[1]Rom. 8: 26, 27.

prays under the tuition and guidance of the divine Spirit. When man desires any good, seeks any good, accomplishes any good, he finds that God desired, sought and accomplished that good with him, in him and through him. God takes the initiative in all good, and prayer is no exception to the rule. In every desire of good, in every heart yearning and longing, "unuttered or expressed," God is seeking to bring to pass his will for good to men. In prayer, then, man is not striving against God, but striving with God to bring to pass that which God wills should be brought to pass.

We might sum up, then, by saying that the purpose of prayer is that man may keep himself in fellowship with God and thus God can work in and through man to carry out his purpose of grace in the world. Its scope is universal in that anything that concerns us is a proper subject for prayer.

3. Objections and difficulties in regard to prayer.

(1) One question often asked is: Does prayer change the will of God? In many different ways and on many different grounds it is often maintained that prayer does not in any way change God, but that it only changes man.

In the first place, to answer this question correctly we would have to define what is meant by changing the will of God. If we mean by the will of God, God's ultimate purpose or plan for the universe and man, then we must say that prayer does not change his will. In this sense we must say that God's will (or his plan for man) includes prayer and its answer. In other words, prayer is grounded in the will of God. God included prayer and its answer in his plan for the world. We can pray in confidence, knowing that God intended that we should pray. But if we mean by the will of God an executive volition on his part, then prayer does change the will of God. That is, God wills some things in response to man's prayer that otherwise he would not will. Dr. Forsythe is right, then, when he says that it is God's will that man by prayer

should change God's will.[1] God does something in answer to prayer that he would not do if man did not pray. The only ground upon which this can be denied is to deny the personality of God. If God is a person and has regard in his dealings with man to personal relations and moral distinctions, then he must respond to man's direct approaches to him as a person. This is the same objection that we considered in relation to forgiveness of sins. As there pointed out, to hold that God changes in response to man's spiritual approach is not a denial of God's immutability. It is simply saying that God is a person and is not the slave of his own immutability; it is saying that God's immutability is the unchangeableness of his character and wisdom and that he is not an immobile, impersonal force.

Sometimes it is objected that to say that God changes his will in answer to prayer would make God the puppet of man. It is said that it is man's business to do God's will rather than God's business to do man's will. In reply, it may be said that prayer is doing God's will. It is God's will that man should pray. God adjusts himself to man as a person. He moves by his Spirit on man's heart to pray in the direction of his will. All praying that does not go in the direction of God's will is vain.

(2) Another phase of this same difficulty is with reference to God's foreknowledge. It is sometimes said that, in case God foreknows all things, then prayer cannot change anything and, therefore, prayer is useless. What is the use to pray, if things are already fixed and God knows beforehand what the outcome will be?

In reply, it may be pointed out, in the first place, that this is no more a difficulty in regard to prayer than it is in regard to God's relation to man's personal activity in any other respect. It is simply a phase of man's relation as free and personal to God as sovereign and absolute. So far as prayer is concerned in relation to God's

[1] See the volume on "Prayer" in the series, "Little Books on Religion."

perfect knowledge, the same thing holds that was pointed out in regard to prayer in relation to the will of God, that is, God's foreknowledge includes prayer as an element or factor in it. If prayer is an element in reality and God foreknows all events, then God foreknows prayer and its answer in relation to all other events in the historical order. But God's foreknowledge is not within itself causative and does not render necessary the event that is foreknown; that is, the element of freedom or contingency is not taken out of the event in its being foreknown. Prayer and its answer are known of God as factors to be taken account of as to what God himself will do.

Jesus uses God's perfect knowledge as an encouragement to men to pray rather than as a discouragement. He says that, because God knows beforehand what our needs are, is a reason why we should ask for them to be supplied.[1] Sometimes men say that, because God knows beforehand what our needs are, therefore, there is no need to tell him. But he does know our needs and he knows that to keep in touch with God and to recognize and acknowledge our dependence on him is our chief need. Consequently he has made it so that our every need should draw us to him. All our minor needs should remind us of our one chief need. And many times, all unconsciously to ourselves, we are brought to recognize our need of God through some other need that we bring to him.

(3) Another difficulty often raised with reference to prayer is in regard to the order of nature. It is said that prayer cannot be answered in the physical realm because this would destroy the causal connections of the phenomena of the world. This objection is made on the ground that no force outside the physical realm can operate in that realm; otherwise we would have events occurring in the physical realm for which there were no physical antecedents or causes, and this would make

[1]Matt. 6: 8.

science impossible. Unless events can be determined by their physical antecedents only, then science cannot trace the causal connections among phenomena, and, therefore, science is impossible.

We have met this objection in regard to miracles and at other points in our discussion; so it is not necessary to dwell on it here at length. All that needs to be said is that we know in experience the physical and the spiritual as mutually influencing and conditioning each other. Otherwise we must negate one or the other realm or have dualism. And, as a matter of experience, we do know the personal realm as being vitally linked with the sub-personal and as influencing that realm and being influenced by it. More especially, if we believe in a personal God of supreme power, will we see no difficulty in allowing that he controls and directs events in the physical as well as in the spiritual realm. In our own dealings with the physical we know that spirit or personality controls matter for its own ends and does so without violating the constitution of the physical or upsetting the order of the world. Much more can we believe that the same thing can be done by the God in whose will the whole world order has its existence and support.

Because of the difficulty here under consideration, some hold that prayer is answered only subjectively, not in the outer world. That is, they hold that prayer is answered only in its effect upon the one who prays. With some, prayer is reduced to a form of meditation only, a matter of reflection and aspiration. There is nothing of petition to a personal God. This is practically the pantheistic attitude. Others go further and recognize petition to a personal God, but would deny that it is answered except in the spiritual realm. They hold that God responds to our petitions in power to transform our characters and perhaps even to transform the characters of others, but deny that he changes the order

of events in the outer world in answer to prayer. But Biblical teaching and example, as well as experience, justify us in holding that God does bring things to pass in the physical as well as the spiritual realm in response to the prayers of his people.

(4) In general, it may be said that the best answer to difficulties concerning answers to prayer is not the theoretical answer, but the practical answer of experience. The great question is not, Can God answer prayer? but, Does he answer prayer? And the best way to find out concerning that is to pray. This does not mean that one can pray just to find out whether God answers prayer and by that means find out. If he prays just to find the answer to that question, he will not find it. To find out whether prayer is answered or not, one must pray in the spirit of religion, not simply in the spirit of scientific investigation or philosophical speculation. And as long as men find in experience that God does answer prayer, there is no use to set up speculative difficulties saying that he cannot. There is no objection to our seeking as far as possible the limits within which God answers prayer, the principles governing his answering, and the method by which he works. But it is vain for us on *a priori* grounds to conclude beforehand that God cannot answer prayer. Men have often decided that things could not take place when, as a matter of fact, they were taking place all around them. The prayer instinct is one of the deepest in the nature of man; and millions have found that God has answered their cry with ready help. As long as man is what he is in nature and constitution, he will pray. When man ceases to pray, he will be something other than man.

4. Conditions of answer to prayer. In one sense, there is no such thing as unanswered prayer. Taking prayer in the sense of communion with God, one does not commune with God and fail to get a response from God. The very idea of communion carries with it a mutual

activity on the part of God and man; so that, if God should not respond to man's approach, there would not be communion; there would only be an unsuccessful effort on man's part to establish communion. What man seeks, or should seek, in prayer is not, first of all, some thing that God may give, but God himself. So that, if there is prayer in the sense of communion with God, this carries with it the idea of a response on God's part and this response is God's answer to man's approach. In this sense there is no prayer that is not answered. Sometimes, however, there is an effort on man's part to approach God without the proper spiritual adjustment on man's part. In this case, communion with God is not established. In that sense prayer may be unanswered.

Usually, however, when men speak of unanswered prayer, they have reference to petitionary prayer. That is, they mean that man asks for something and does not get what he asks for. In this sense also there may be unanswered prayers. Men ask God for things they do not get. This may be due to the fact that they ask God for things that God in his wisdom sees best that they should not have. He will not give the things that would injure his children. He gives good things,[1] and we must always in asking submit to his wisdom as to whether it is best that we should have what we ask for.

There are certain spiritual conditions, however, that are necessary to our obtaining and maintaining communion with God. Without these there can be no conscious fellowship with God. They are conditions of obtaining our petitions of God, because they are conditions of communion with God. A number of these conditions are named in the New Testament. One of them is faith.[2] If one prays in faith, God grants his petition. This does not mean that one can ask for just anything and believe, and then get what he asks for. One cannot have faith except as one is drawn into spiritual unity

[1]Matt. 7: 7-11. [2]Matt. 21: 22; James 1: 6.

with God. This guarantees two things. One is that one will not ask contrary to God's will; man's will will be submitted to God's. The other is that one will be under the guidance of the Spirit and the Spirit does not lead us to trust God for something that it is not his will for us to have. Faith as a condition of successful prayer, therefore, carries with it two other conditions—praying in accordance with the will of God,[1] and praying under the guidance of the Spirit.[2] It is stated in another way in John 14: 13. We are to pray in the name of Jesus; that is, as those who live for him, those who seek to do his work in the world, those who represent him. We can only pray in his name as we live in spiritual unity with him. In John 15: 7 this thought is presented in another way: We are to abide in Christ and have his word abiding in us. In other places men are urged to be persistent in prayer.[3] But persistence is simply one evidence of faith. It is faith holding on in spite of delay and discouragement.

Whatever term is used, then, in naming the condition of successful prayer, it is always in essence the same, namely, spiritual harmony or unity with God, surrender to his will. There must be no conscious holding back of ourselves from God. If we expect him to give himself to us, there must be the completest giving of ourselves to him.

IV. **The persistence of the Christian life.** There is a wide difference of opinion on the question as to whether the Christian life will with certainty persist in the face of all opposition. Is it possible for the new life begotten in regeneration to perish? Can a Christian fall away and be lost?

1. Let us first make clear what is involved in the doctrine usually known as the final perseverance of the saints. This does not involve the antinomian position

[1] 1 John 5: 14.
[2] Rom. 8: 26, 27.
[3] Luke 11: 5ff; 18: 1ff.

that, since one is in justification delivered from sin, he is, therefore, made eternally safe, no matter what he may become in character and life. This is a perversion of the truth that becomes about as great a heresy as the one which it denies. The New Testament teaching is not that a justified man is saved irrespective of what he may be in character; it is rather that the justifying and regenerating grace of God so revolutionizes his character that he can never be again what he was before. It is not that the Christian is saved whether he persists in faith or not; it is that he will persist in faith and will, therefore, attain to final salvation. The New Testament teaches that in one sense the Christian is saved when he believes.[1] In another sense, he is to be saved at the last day.[2] This latter is usually called salvation in the eschatological sense. It is completed in the resurrection. Salvation includes everything between regeneration and resurrection. Perseverance is a condition of salvation in the eschatological sense. He that endureth to the end shall be saved.[3] In the book of Revelation the emphasis is on the fact that it is the one who overcomes, who is faithful unto death, that gets the victor's crown.[4] It is sometimes said that we do not have to hold on to Christ, because he holds on to us. He does hold on to us, but we must also hold on to him. He holds us by causing us to hold to him. That is, the perseverance of the saints is based on the preservation of the saints. We persevere because he keeps. But it is not true to say that, because he keeps us, we do not need to persevere.

One mistake that is sometimes made in regard to this matter is that, when one speaks of perseverance as a condition of salvation, people immediately think of perseverance in works. That is, they think perseverance as a condition of salvation means that one is brought

[1]John 3: 36; Eph. 2: 8.
[2]1 Thess. 5: 8; Tit. 3: 7; 1 Peter 1: 5.
[3]Mark 13: 13.
[4]2: 7, 17, 26; 3: 5, 12, 21.

into saving relationship with God through faith and then put on a basis of works and from there on must earn or deserve his salvation. But it does not mean this. It means that one must persevere as he began, namely, in faith. Salvation is by grace on God's part and by faith on man's part. It is altogether of grace on God's part and altogether by faith on man's part. It begins in faith, continues in faith and is consummated in faith. We are kept by the power of God, through faith, unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last day[1] God keeps us, but he keeps us through faith, not independently of faith. Man is not saved by trusting for a moment. The Christian life is a life of trust. Perseverance is not something beyond faith as a condition of salvation; it is of the nature of faith to persevere; if it does not persevere, it is not faith. To say that one must persevere to be saved, is simply saying that the faith that saves is a faith that persists. If it does not persist, it does not have vitality enough to save.

2. What is some of the evidence for the view that the truly regenerated man will persevere in faith to the end? Or to put it the other way, what evidence do we have that God will keep his children to the end, that he will cause us to persevere?

(1) One evidence is that faith is produced in our hearts in pursuance of God's eternal purpose. As previously stated, the doctrine of election means that, when God saves a man, he does so in pursuance of a purpose formed "before times eternal." Since God regenerates in pursuance of this eternal purpose, it is not likely that he will fail to carry out this purpose. The work which he began in us he will carry on to completion.[2]

(2) Another thing pointing in the same direction is the completeness of the atoning work of Christ. There is a full and complete atonement made by Christ for all the sinner's sins. This offering was made once for all.[3] The

[1] 1 Peter 1: 5.
[2] Phil. 1: 6.
[3] Heb. 7: 26, 27; 9: 12; 10: 10-14.

man who puts his confidence for salvation in Christ's atoning work has a good basis for his assurance of acceptance with God and final deliverance from sin.

(3) Another argument is the doctrine of justification based on Christ's atoning work. As pointed out above, when the sinner believes in Christ, he is justified once for all. He never comes again under the condemnation of sin.[1] It is difficult to see how anyone could deny that, if the doctrines of election, atonement and justification are true, they at least create a strong presumption in favor of the doctrine we are now considering.

(4) The life brought to us in Christ is described in many places in the New Testament as eternal life. This at least suggests that it is enduring in its quality. Four times in John 6 Jesus sweeps everything up to the "last day" and says that in that day he will raise those that believe in him.

Remember that the doctrine as we maintain it is that God preserves the Christian by causing him to persevere in faith. In regeneration his moral nature is so revolutionized that he persists in faith in God and, therefore, in a life of righteousness. This is John's view in 1 John 3: 6-9. He says that the one who is begotten (or born) of God does not commit sin; that is, he does not live a life of sin. John says it is a moral impossibility; he cannot sin. Not that there is any external constraint laid on him. His freedom is not interfered with. But he is given a new life by faith in Christ that cannot compromise with sin and that sin can never overcome. In regeneration there is something put within a man that will never let him rest in sin; he must fight sin until it is vanquished. This is not ensalvement; it is freedom. Nor does this mean that one never commits an act of sin after he becomes a Christian; it means rather that the general course of life is changed. John uses the present tense that denotes a habit of life, a constant atti-

[1]John 5: 24.

tude. It is this new life within that is imperishable in its nature that guarantees persistence in the fight on sin until sin is conquered.

(5) The fact that we are by faith brought into vital union with Christ is a guarantee that the new life will persist. He becomes our life, our all. Because he lives, we shall live also.[1] Christ dwells in us and we in him. And he that is in us is greater than he that is in the world.[2] The living Christ, to whom we are united by faith, having justified us in his blood, will deliver us in the end from the wrath of God.[3]

(6) This doctrine is also supported by the fact of Christ's intercession for the Christian. Just before Peter's denial of Jesus, the Master said to him: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you (the apostles), that he might sift you as wheat: but I have made supplication for thee (the one individual), that thy faith fail not."[4] Here we see that Jesus made intercession for Simon individually, and his request for him was that his faith should not fail. Jesus says that, while he was in the world, he kept those that the Father gave him. He so guarded them that not one of them was lost, save the son of perdition (Judas Iscariot, who was never saved). Now, since he is going away, he prays the Father to keep them.[5] These two examples of prayer for his disciples may give us some idea of the kind of intercession Christ is making now on behalf of his people. The ground of our safety is the fact that Jesus is now living and active on our behalf. This is specifically expressed in the book of Hebrews: "Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."[6] The thought here is that he saves completely, to the end, because of his living to make intercession for those who come to God through him. His

[1]John 14: 19.
[2]1 John 4: 4.
[3]Rom. 5: 9, 10.
[4]Luke 22: 31, 32.
[5]John 17: 11-15.
[6]7: 25.

intercessory work guarantees the completeness of their salvation.

(7) Paul expresses the thought of the believer's security in a somewhat different way under the idea of the sealing of the Spirit. Upon hearing and believing the gospel we were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.[1] The Holy Spirit of promise means that the Holy Spirit dwelling within us is God's promise or pledge that our redemption will be completed in the resurrection of the body. In the Holy Spirit we are sealed unto the day of redemption.[2] This is the meaning of Paul's expression that God has given us the earnest of the Spirit.[3] The word translated earnest here means pledge money that one put up as a forfeit to guarantee that he would not go back on a contract or trade entered into, but would carry out his part of the contract. The Holy Spirit of promise is the Spirit dwelling within us as God's guarantee that we shall enter into the full possession of our inheritance in the redemption of our bodies. God pledges himself to complete our redemption. The Spirit not only bears witness to our present acceptance with God, but also bears witness to the fact that we are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ.[4] As heirs of God we look forward to the time when we shall enter into possession of our full inheritance. We have the first fruits of the Spirit; that is, the Spirit as dwelling within us is a beginning, a sample, of the fuller possession that we are to have later on. This gives us that groaning within ourselves, that eternal dissatisfaction with ourselves as we are, and that eager longing for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our bodies that will consummate our salvation. This makes our salvation a hope salvation. We hope for fuller blessings than we now enjoy, and the Spirit within is God's guarantee that we shall enter upon that fuller possession.[5]

[1]Eph. 1: 13.
[2]Eph. 4: 30.
[3]2 Cor. 1: 22; 5: 5; Eph. 1: 14.
[4]Rom. 8: 17.
[5]See Rom. 8: 23-25.

(8) We have certain definite statements in the New Testament that cannot be explained on any other hypothesis. We can consider only a few of the outstanding ones. Jesus says that he gives to his sheep eternal life and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of his hand. Nor is any one able to snatch them out of his Father's hand.[1] Here the unequivocal declaration of Jesus that those to whom he gives eternal life shall never perish would be difficult to harmonize with any view that allowed a Christian to fall away and perish. Jesus says again that the one who hears his word and believes on the one who sent him has eternal life and comes not into condemnation.[2] In Rom. 8: 35-39, after Paul enumerates the things that might be thought able to separate one from the love of God, he concludes by saying that none of these shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Peter says that we are kept by the power of God through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last day.[3]

These passages seem clearly to affirm that God keeps those that believe in Christ and that there is no possibility of their perishing.

3. Objections to the doctrine.

(1) Objection is sometimes made to this doctrine on the ground that it would be inconsistent with man's freedom. The objection is based on an untenable idea of freedom. It is based on the idea that freedom means that character never becomes so fixed that it is certain that one will never change fundamentally from right to wrong or wrong to right. It holds that for one to be free there must always be the possibility of such a change. One never becomes so fixed in evil that he may not choose the right, nor so confirmed in righteousness that he cannot choose the wrong. According to this conception of freedom

[1]John 10: 28, 29. [2]John 5: 24. [3]1 Peter 1: 5.

there could not be irreversible fixity of character even in the next life. Moreover, God would not be free for we are told that God cannot do evil, such as to lie, nor can he even be tempted to wrong.[1] As a matter of fact a character fixed in righteousness is the thing that constitutes spiritual freedom. To have real freedom two things are necessary. One is an undying passion for righteousness and hatred for sin; the other is a sufficient moral dynamic to enable one to overcome sin. Regeneration gives both. Regeneration guarantees ultimate triumph over sin. There may be temporary reverses and setbacks. Ideally considered and seen from the point of view of the ultimate outcome, John's description of the regenerate man as one who does not sin is true to fact. And this is true of him, not because he is enslaved and his will destroyed, but because he is given a new moral dynamic and he is set free from the tyranny of sin. He is liberated from the thraldom that Paul describes in Rom. 7 and enjoys the spiritual freedom described in Rom. 8.

(2) Another objection is that this doctrine encourages one to a life of sin. It is said that, if one has the assurance of final salvation, then he is at liberty to live as he pleases.

But it must be remembered that this doctrine is predicated on the presupposition that one is regenerated, and that regeneration means that one's moral nature is so renewed in the image of Christ that he can never again rest in sin. If the deepest longing of one's heart is for a life of sin, then, of course, he will live a life of sin. That is inevitable. But the fact that he longs for a life of sin is evidence that he has not been regenerated. There can be no external constraint nor fear of punishment that will keep an unrenewed man from living in sin. On the other hand, the regenerated man will con-

[1]Titus 1: 2; Heb. 6: 18; James 1: 13.

quer sin because the deepest passion of his soul is love to God and hatred of sin.

It is a misrepresentation of this doctrine to say that it means that, if one ever becomes a Christian, he is saved, no matter how he may live. One might as well say that, if one is born a white man, he will be a white man all his life, even though he should change to a negro. If one is born a white man, he will be a white man all his life just because his changing to anything else is an impossibility. Likewise if one is made a Christian by the power of God's regenerating grace, he remains a Christian forever, because it is a moral and spiritual impossibility ever to become anything else. It is not true, then, that God saves a regenerated man any how. God saves him a very particular how; and that how is that God puts within him, by virtue of his union with Christ by faith, an imperishable life. That imperishable life becomes a moral guarantee that the Christian will persevere in faith and finally conquer sin. This doctrine does not mean that we will conquer sin whether we fight it or not; rather does it mean that we have the promise of such help as to assure victory. Therefore, we fight sin with courage and hope.

(3) Another objection is that the Bible teaches the opposite doctrine popularly called "falling from grace"; that is, that one may be saved and then fall away and be lost. Sometimes the opposing doctrine is stated as being that one must "hold out faithful" or he will be lost. But theologians of all schools grant that one must "hold out faithful"; that is, if one should cease to have faith, he would be lost. The point at issue is whether or not a truly regenerated man will cease to have faith. It is not a question as to whether persistence in faith is necessary or not; it is rather the question as to whether there is anything in God's relation to the Christian and in the nature of the new life begotten in regeneration that guarantees the persistence of the believer in faith. To cite passages in the New Testament that teach the neces-

sity of perseverance in faith or that such perseverance is necessary to final salvation is altogether a different thing from showing that the New Testament teaches that one may be a Christian and then fall away and be lost. With this in mind we maintain that the passages claimed to teach apostasy would come rather under one of the following heads:

a. Passages that teach that persevering faith is necessary to final deliverance from sin. Under this head we would put such passages as Matt. 24: 13; Mark 13: 13; 1 Cor. 15: 2; Rev. 2: 7, 11, 17, 26; 3: 5, 12, 21. Other passages of like import could be found. These show that it takes a faith of persevering, conquering power to save.

Here we must remember that a thing may be certain from the standpoint of God's purpose and yet humanly conditioned and from that point of view contingent. A good illustration of this is found in Paul's experience in the storm on his way to Rome as a prisoner.[1] In the midst of the storm Paul told the company on the ship that God had assured him that they would all, without the loss of a man, be saved.[2] Yet later on when the sailors were about to escape in the boat, Paul told the soldiers that, if the sailors got out in the boat, they (the soldiers) could not be saved.[3]

The salvation of a man elected to salvation is from all eternity certain in the mind and purpose of God, yet it is conditioned upon faith; and it is conditioned upon a faith that perseveres and conquers. A man may be elected to salvation and yet his salvation conditioned upon the fact that somebody shall preach to him the gospel. One might ask: "Suppose God should elect a man to salvation and then the proper conditions not arise?" One might as well suppose any other absurdity. That assumption assumes that a set of conditions might arise that God did not know about and had not provided

[1]Acts 27: 14ff. [2]Vs. 22-25. [3]Vs. 30-32.

for. Such is the assumption that a regenerated man should not persevere in faith.

b. There are other passages where the thought probably is that perseverance in faith is evidence of regeneration and godly character. Perhaps this is the significance of John 8: 31; Heb. 3: 6, 14; 4: 14; 2 John 9. Possibly this is one of the thoughts underlying John 15: 1ff (especially verses 6, 7).

c. This thought stated in another way means that those who have faith only in name and profession fall away and thereby manifest the superficial character of their faith. See Matt. 13: 20, 21; Mark 4: 16, 17; 2 Peter 2: 20-22; 1 John 2: 19.

d. There are other passages where the writer is emphasizing the lack of development in Christian character or the loss of reward for faithful service. See 1 Cor. 3: 14, 15; Heb. 5: 12—6: 8; 2 Pet. 1: 8-11.

e. Still other passages seem to be emphasizing the danger of rejecting gospel truth on the part of the unregenerate when one knows it, especially where there has been spiritual enlightenment to understand the truth. See Matt. 12: 43-45; Luke 11: 24-26; Heb. 10: 26-31; 2 Peter 2: 20-22; 1 John 5: 16.

V. **The growth of the Christian life.**

It is customary to discuss the development of the Christian life under the term sanctification. But, as already stated, the prevailing use of this term in the New Testament is to denote the initiation of the Christian life, not its development. Besides the term sanctify (or sanctification) is only one of a number of terms used to denote the development of the Christian life. For these reasons, we prefer to use the expression growth or development of the Christian life.

1. The need of growth. That the new life begun in regeneration needs development would hardly seem to need proof. That this life is susceptible of growth and needs to grow is everywhere assumed in the New Testa-

ment. This is shown by some of the terms used for Christians. One of the earliest and most common designations for them was disciples. A disciple is a learner, a pupil in the school of Christ. Becoming a Christian is enrolling in the school. One must start in the elementary things and advance grade by grade. Then the Christian is sometimes called a soldier. When one enlists in the army, he must go through a course of drilling and discipline before he can become an effective soldier. Undeveloped Christians are called babes. Christian teachers sometimes rebuked these babes and manifested sorrow and disappointment because they had not made development in the Christian life.[1] Peter exhorts Christians to grow in grace.[2]

While not many have theoretically denied the need of growth in the Christian life, yet as a practical matter it has been greatly neglected in church life, especially in those denominations that have laid emphasis on the need of conversion as a definite, conscious experience and that have, therefore, placed great stress upon public evangelism and revivals. Some other religious bodies have emphasized teaching and training to the neglect of preaching and evangelism. To get the best results, the two phases of work must go together. Those who have emphasized evangelism have seemed at times to forget that conversion was only the beginning of the Christian life. They have forgotten that the new convert who is to-day rejoicing in his new experience and walking on the delectable mountains may to-morrow be a prisoner in the castle of doubt or even floundering in the slough of despond. They have forgotten that old habits of sin must often be conquered and that the whole emotional, intellectual and volitional life of the convert with all his social relations and activities, need to be brought into captivity to Christ.

2. Foes to growth. There are certain things that stand in the way of growth. We will look at the opposing

[1] 1 Cor. 3: 1ff; Heb. 5: 12ff. [2] 2 Peter 3: 18.

forces, the forces that must be overcome if any progress is to be made in the Christian life. Sometimes one is deceived by the thought that, when he becomes a Christian, all his struggles are over; but it would be nearer the truth to say that his struggles are just begun. The difference between his present and his past condition is not that he is now put beyond the need of struggle and effort. The difference is rather that now he is given a disposition that will not let him rest in sin and that makes it possible for him to overcome it. But his enemies are not dead and he must fight.

The forces to be overcome can be summed up in the three familiar words, the world, the flesh and the devil.

By the flesh is meant human nature in its sinful disposition, out from under the dominion of the Spirit It is unsanctified human nature. The Christian man finds that he is now two instead of one. There is the "old man" and the "new," the "flesh" and the "spirit," and between these there is ceaseless warfare. The flesh has been crucified, but it must be put to death daily. This must be done until the life on earth is over. The flesh cannot be put to death once for all so that it does not need to be done again. And unless the flesh is kept in subjection, there can be no progress in the Christian life. Progress in the Christian life depends upon the overcoming of those impulses and tendencies in one's life that oppose the will of God.

But opposition to progress in the Christian life comes not only from within but also from without. The world sums up all those forces operative in human society around us that stand opposed to the will of God. The general currents of life around us are set against the development of true spirituality. Jesus did not find a very congenial atmosphere when he was on earth, and he did not encourage his disciples to expect that they would. On the other hand, he warned them that they would be treated as he had been.[1] Not everybody would

[1]Matt. 10: 24ff.

receive them and their message.[1] Woe unto them when all men should speak well of them.[2] Paul says that the man who lives a godly life shall suffer persecution.[3] Peter exhorts his hearers to save themselves from a crooked generation.[4] John regards the world as evil and perishing.[5] But the Christian has within him a power that enables him to overcome the world.[6]

The devil is the prince of this world.[7] He is the one who inspires and directs all these evil forces within and without and uses them to tear down Christian character. He delights to test God's people. He puts them in his sieve and shakes them up when he can.[8] But his power is limited. He can only test God's people as he is given permission and to the extent that he is permitted.[9] Only the chaff is destroyed by his sifting, the wheat is preserved. The Christian should resist the devil and he will flee.[10] We can overcome him in the blood of Jesus and the word of our testimony.[11]

While these are the foes of the spiritual life and will hinder the development of that life unless we overcome them, yet if we conquer these foes, they can by being overcome be made to contribute to our spiritual life. The Christian gets development in the spiritual life by struggling against these enemies and by the grace of God overcoming them.

3. The means of growth. By the means of growth we intend those agencies and forces that contribute directly to our advancement in the Christian life. These are sometimes spoken of as means of grace. They include all those means or agencies by which we become familiar with the principles of the gospel of Christ and more fully appropriate that gospel. They are the same

[1]Luke 10: 16.
[2]Luke 6: 26.
[3]2 Tim. 3: 12.
[4]Acts 2: 40.
[5]1 John 2: 15-17.
[6]1 John 4: 4; 5: 4, 5.
[7]John 12: 31; 14: 30.
[8]Luke 22: 31ff.
[9]Job. 1: 12; Luke 22: 31.
[10]James 4: 7.
[11]Rev. 12: 11.

as the means by which we are brought into saving contact with the gospel, such as the church, the ministry, the ordinances, the Bible, prayer, personal influence and testimony.

This does not signify that any of these things within themselves have the power to augment the spiritual life. They no more have the power to do that than they have the power at first to regenerate or make alive. It is the power of God alone that can regenerate or develop the regenerate life. This idea is suggested by the expression "means of grace." These things are means by which we are enabled to appropriate the grace of God. Our development in the spiritual life is just as much a matter of grace as our justification or regeneration. We can no more make ourselves grow than we can make ourselves alive at first. They are equally the work of God and equally a work of grace. Paul speaking of his efficiency in the Christian life says: "By the grace of God I am what I am."[1]

4. The condition of growth. The condition of growth is the same as the condition of entrance upon the Christian life; namely, repentance and faith; or using faith as inclusive of repentance, we might say it is faith alone. There must be continued and increasing repudiation of sin and opposition to it in our lives and continued and increasing dependence on Christ. Since our development in the Christian life is a work of grace on God's part, it must be a matter of faith on our part by which we appropriate his grace. To put it another way, our growth in the Christian life is the growth of our faith. The increase of faith is the growth of the divine life within us. This is due to the fact that faith is the means or condition of our union with Christ. This does not mean that faith is the only Christian grace, but it means that faith is the means of our fellowship with Christ by which these other graces are developed. Faith is the root prin-

[1] 1 Cor. 15: 10.

ciple of the Christian life. It is the germinal grace. Out of it grow all the other graces.

There must be struggle on our part against evil. Faith must not only trust and rest in the Lord; it must also agonize in its contention against sin and evil. There is the rest of faith, but there is also the struggle of faith. The statement is sometimes made to the effect that one cannot any more make himself grow spiritually than he can cause himself to grow physically; that all one can do is to conform to the laws of growth and he will naturally grow without effort on his part. It is true that all Christian development is the work of God and that we grow by conforming to the laws of growth. But there is a difference between physical and spiritual development and the laws governing each. And one of the laws of spiritual development is that there must be struggle against evil in oneself and in the world around him. There must be consecrated service to God and man and striving after holiness. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled."[1] But this hungering and thirsting after righteousness must be more than a passing desire; it must be the deepest passion of the soul; it must be such a passion of the soul as to control and direct the energies and activities of life. God will give to one all the righteousness he wants; but he must want it; must want it so that he would fight for it, even die for it. Righteousness of character is no easily won achievement. The most difficult thing in the world is to be righteous. One must be willing to wade through the fires of hell to attain it.

But some one says: "Is not righteousness the gift of God's grace?" Yes, it is. But God can give only as we receive, only as we attain. The experience of regeneration is no easy-going transaction in which the soul is passively quickened into life. It is the supreme crisis of the soul in which the soul agonizes after God and right-

[1]Matt. 5: 6.

eousness and renounces forever sin and Satan. And the progressive sanctification of the life or growth in grace is of the same nature. God makes the soul righteous by creating this passion for righteousness in the soul. He gives, but he gives through our effort. Our achievement is his bestowal. God feeds the birds, but he feeds them through their efforts. God gives the farmer his harvest, but he does so through the farmer's planting and cultivation of the soil and his toil in gathering the harvest. He gives a man an education, but he gives it through years of toil and self-denying study. He gives the musician his skill in winning music from his instrument, but he does so through study and practice. We thank him daily for bread which he gives by the labor of brain and hand. So he gives righteousness of character, but he gives it through struggle and effort. Faith receives what God gives, and God gives what faith achieves.

5. The perfection theory of growth. In different forms there has arisen in Christian history the theory that man may attain perfection in this life. Sometimes it is held that this is attained in a great crisis. This crisis has sometimes been spoken of as a second work of grace. This work is spoken of as sanctification over against the first work of grace in regeneration or justification. People are exhorted to seek this experience as definitely as they sought the experience of regeneration. According to this theory, "carnal" Christians or "babes" in Christ are in a moment made into "spiritual" Christians.

There are a number of serious objections to this view.

One is that it tends to produce in those holding it a self-satisfied spirit and a Pharisaical attitude toward others. They look upon other Christians as "babes" and as "carnal." It is never a good indication for one to claim to be free from sin. The closer one gets to God, the less apt is he to claim to be sinless.

Again, those who hold this view usually lower the standard of righteousness. By being free from sin they

often mean free from deliberate and conscious acts of transgression. Or they may mean by Christian perfection a heart of love toward God and a sincere purpose to serve him and do his will. They rarely go so far as to claim that all promptings and tendencies toward evil are taken out of one's nature. So when one comes to discuss perfection, it would be necessary for him, first, to define what he means by perfection. Most anyone could reach a standard of perfection if you would let him bring the standard of perfection down low enough. Any man could reach the stars if he could bring the stars near enough to the earth. Those who hold this view use such words as "holiness" and "sanctify" with a good deal of glibness and freedom.

This theory is also wrong with reference to its view of Christian growth. Christians do not attain to maturity at one bound. Sin is not completely eradicated from the nature of man at a stroke. One cannot help but feel that those who hold this view do not see as they ought the radical nature of sin and do not realize its stubborn hold upon man.

This theory does not agree with the teaching of the Bible. There are places where men are spoken of as perfect, such as Noah and Job.[1] Men were commanded to be perfect.[2] The word translated "perfect" here probably means blameless, free from fault, whole-hearted, sincere—using all these terms in a relative, not an absolute sense. A perfect man was a full-grown, well-developed, sincere servant of God.[3] The pure in heart shall see God,[4] and without sanctification no man shall see him;[5] but we are not to conclude that perfect purity of heart or perfect holiness is to be attained at one leap. John describes the regenerated man as one who does not

[1]Gen. 6: 9; Job 1: 1.
[2]Gen. 17: 1; Deut. 18: 13.
[3]See in N .T. 1 Cor. 2: 6; Eph. 4: 13; Phil. 3: 15; Heb. 5: 14; 6: 1. In some of these passages the Greek word is translated "p e r f e c t," in others, "full-grown."
[4]Matt. 5: 8.
[5]Heb. 12: 14.

commit sin, but practices righteousness.[1] This evidently does not mean that the regenerated man never commits an act of sin; much less does it mean that the nature or disposition to sin is entirely removed in regeneration. John uses here the present tense of the verb, as elsewhere, to denote a continuous or habitual course of conduct, a fixed or settled tendency of life. Besides, whatever he means by "sinneth not" and "doeth no sin" he affirms as true of every regenerated man, not of Christians who have been "sanctified" in a second work of grace. If he means by these expressions absolute sinlessness, then he affirms that all Christians are sinless. That would be affirming too much, even for the modern "sanctificationist" or the most enthusiastic "holy roller."

Besides the same author says: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."[2] Here he is evidently speaking of Christians and from a Christian point of view. It is hardly probable that he would affirm here that no man can claim to be free from sin, and then in the third chapter affirm that all Christians are sinless.

Paul's statement in Phil. 3 is instructive on this point. He does not count that he has obtained or been made perfect (verse 12). He does not count that he has laid hold (verse 13). But he stretches forward with all his might, striving to lay hold of that for which Christ has laid hold of him (verses 12-14). He implies that the "perfect" or full-grown Christian is the one who recognizes his imperfection. The one who claims to be sinless, therefore, claims more than Paul could claim. But he does not thereby show himself a man of wisdom, but rather advertises himself as one who is lacking in spiritual discernment.

6. The goal of development. The goal or standard toward which we are to strive is nothing less than that of a perfect Christian character. According to the mean-

[1] 1 John 2: 29; 3: 6-9. [2] 1 John 1: 8.

ing of the law in its spiritual content this would demand that one love God with all the powers of his being and his neighbor as himself.[1] Christ himself was the embodiment and revelation of what God would have man to be. To be like Christ is, therefore, the goal of the Christian's ambition. Or, as Jesus puts it in Matt. 5: 48, we are to strive to be as perfect in character as the heavenly Father himself is perfect. Here is an ideal that remains as a constant challenge to higher endeavor and attainment in the Christian life. No matter what heights of attainment in character one may climb, he finds other heights still towering above him and challenging him to yet greater achievements. To attain these we must do more than sing, "Lord, plant my feet on higher ground"; we must also climb.

Protestant theology has usually held that the complete purification of the soul from sin was accomplished at death when the soul passed into the presence of the Lord and beheld him in beatific vision. While it might be difficult to find Scripture statements that clearly and explicitly teach this, yet it seems to be thoroughly in harmony with Scripture principles and a fair inference from what is taught about the soul's passing into his presence at death. So far as the complete transformation of soul and body is concerned, that seems to be put at the final appearing of Christ when we shall see him as he is.[2] There is nothing, however, in this to forbid the idea that we shall go on growing in knowledge and character even throughout the endless ages.

[1]Mark 12: 29-31. [2]1 John 3: 2.

CHAPTER V

THE CONSUMMATION OF SALVATION: THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

I. Difficulty of eschatology.
   1. Main reason for the difficulty.
   2. No systematic treatment of the subject.
   3. Sufficient knowledge of the future for religious ends.

II. Meaning and development of the kingdom of God.
   1. Universal sovereignty of God.
   2. Theocratic kingdom of Israel.
   3. Spiritual kingdom founded by Jesus.
   4. The kingdom as a progressive power in the world.
   5. The eternal kingdom of God.

III. Death and immortal glory.
   1. Old Testament view of death.
   2. Changed view in New Testament.
   3. Causes for this change.
   4. Conclusion as to Christian view.

IV. The final advent of Christ.
   1. The fact of his return.
   2. The nature of his manifestation.
   3. The purpose of his coming.
      (1) To judge the world.
      (2) To usher in the eternal kingdom.
      (3) A cosmic significance.
      (4) Creation, incarnation, consummation.
   4. The time of his coming.
      (1) Two things we cannot do.
         a. Fix the time for the second coming.
         b. Fix plans and programs of human history.
      (2) Is the coming of Christ imminent?
         a. Teaching of Jesus concerning the time.
         b. The expectation of the apostles.

V. Resurrection.
  1. Only one resurrection of all the dead.
    (1) Doctrine stated.
    (2) Objections.
      a. That there will be no resurrection of the unjust.
      b. That the just and unjust will be raised at different times.
  2. The time of the resurrection.
    (1) The view that it will be at time of the second coming
    (2) The view that the Christian comes into possession of the resurrection body at death.
  3. Nature of the resurrection body.
    (1) It will be a body.
    (2) It will grow out of the present body.
    (3) It will have higher powers than the old body.
    (4) Nothing said as to nature of the body of the wicked.

VI. The Judgment.
  1. The certainty of judgment.
  2. The purpose of the judgment.
    (1) To manifest character.
    (2) To assign destiny in accordance with character.
    (3) To consummate human history and vindicate God's dealings with the race.
  3. The ground of judgment.
    (1) Man's relation to God as Creator.
    (2) Law and grace as related to judgment.

VII. Heaven.
  1. The intermediate state.
  2. The eternal state of the righteous.
    (1) Place and state of character.
    (2) Deliverance from sin.
    (3) Fellowship with God.
    (4) Freedom from natural evil.
    (5) Service to God.
    (6) Endless development.

VIII. Hell.
  1. The certainty of future punishment.
    (1) Taught in the Bible.
    (2) Moral order requires it.
    (3) Man's moral nature guarantees it.
    (4) The holiness of God requires it.
  2. The nature and extent of future punishment.
    (1) Nature of punishment may conform to nature of one's sin.
    (2) Will be in proportion to one's guilt.

3. The endlessness of future punishment.
   (1) The view stated.
   (2) Opposing views.
      a. Restorationism.
      b. Annihilationism.

We come now to consider what is usually called eschatology or the doctrine of last things. We must look at this doctrine in relation to, and in the light of, the doctrine of salvation. Christianity is a religion of redemption. It saves man from sin. The salvation that it gives is a present deliverance from the guilt and bondage of sin and the hope of complete deliverance in the life to come from the presence and from every trace of sin. Eschatology, then, is not only related to the doctrine of salvation, it is a part of that doctrine. Our salvation is consummated only in the future life. Our relation to God in the future life must be regarded as a continuation and outgrowth of our relation to him in this life. This is the way it is regarded in the New Testament. We have here the first fruits of the Spirit; the full harvest will come by and by.

Whatever we may hold with reference to the future life must be held in view of the fact just stated; namely, that the next life is viewed in the New Testament as the continuation and consummation of the present life viewed as a life of union with Christ through faith.

Eschatology, then, is to be viewed as a phase of soteriology. The two are vitally related. This is clearly seen in the history of Christian doctrine. A good example of this is the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory. Protestantism has never believed in purgatory, could not consistently do so, because it has believed in salvation by grace. The grace of God has provided full atonement for sin, and by faith the sinner is justified once for all. But since Catholicism mixes salvation by grace and works and makes one's justification to depend on his sanctification, as a logical conclusion there must

be some place where the soul is kept in suffering until it is completely purified and hence entirely justified.

I. **Difficulty of eschatology.**

1. Main reason for the difficulty. Eschatology is the most difficult phase of Christian doctrine to treat. It is the place where there are, perhaps, the most widely divergent opinions. This is due to the nature of the subject. We are dealing with the future life. When we treat of salvation in its beginning and development in this life, we are dealing with a realm in which we have experience and the testimony of thousands of others to guide us. Scripture teaching can be verified by experience and interpreted in the light of experience. Since we have not had experience of the future life, what is revealed to us about that life must be put in terms of the present. There are no other terms in which it can be put. God must reveal the future, if at all, to men in terms that they can understand, and that means in terms of the present life. So the men who received the revelation must receive it in those terms. In turn, these men must pass it on to others the same way. This is a recognized law of pedagogy, that in teaching one must go from the known to the unknown. This is a great limitation. We see this exemplified in the Old Testament. The prophets of the Old Testament received the revelation and stated it in terms of the Old Testament theocracy with which they were acquainted. They did this because there were no other thought forms in which they could put the matter so as to be understood. They must receive and communicate a revelation, if at all, in thought forms that were familiar to them. They thought of the coming kingdom of God as a glorified Judaism, not as a spiritual kingdom that would supplant Judaism. To them it was not a universal spiritual religion with the limitations of Judaism removed; it was rather Judaism extended over the whole earth—it was a new life in the old forms. When it came, the new life

transcended the old forms and left them forever behind. To them the Messianic reign was to be a great kingdom like that of David except more glorious. The temple with its offerings and priesthood was to be restored.[1] Jerusalem was to be the center. To it worshipers from all nations would come.[2] An expectation of a literal fulfillment of these prophecies was one thing that kept the Jews of the days of Jesus from recognizing him as the Messiah. To insist that these prophecies must yet have a literal fulfillment is to confuse the form with the substance. If this program were carried out it would give us Judaism, not Christianity. This will never be. The new wine must be put in new wine skins; the new religion must have its own forms, not those of a decadent religion of the Old Testament age. The book of Hebrews shows that these Old Testament forms and institutions had their fulfillment in Christ. His work once for all realized the thing toward which they pointed; therefore, it is a fundamentally wrong principle to expect that they shall ever be restored. If that be true, these Old Testament prophecies are not to be fulfilled in form. It is the substance we have; the form we do not need. In fact, there is such an inconsistency between form and substance here that we cannot have both. One excludes the other.

Another illustration of this difficulty of revealing the future is found in the case of Jesus and his disciples. From the Gospel records it appears that Jesus announced repeatedly to his disciples, especially from the time of the great confession at Cæsarea Philippi, that he was to die and rise again; but they do not seem to have laid hold of it with any degree of appreciation or understanding. The idea that Jesus was to die they would not entertain and the idea of the resurrection, therefore, meant nothing to them. So they could not get the meaning of his statements until they had been fulfilled in the events themselves.

[1]Isa. 2: 1ff; Ezek. 40—48; *et al.* [2]Zech. 14: 8 *et al.*

2. No systematic treatment of the subject. We have here in exaggerated form the same difficulty that we have in other phases of theology; namely, that the New Testament does not give us a systematic or complete treatment of the subject. We have a treatment of some other phases of theology that approaches more nearly a systematic treatment than anything we have on eschatology; for example, Paul's doctrine of justification in Romans. What we do have is a reference at different times to certain events of the future. Sometimes an event may be viewed in a certain line of development or in a certain relation or for a certain purpose. But nowhere do we have all these lines of development unified in a complete view of the future. These events or lines of development are presented in such a way as to bring out their significance for the salvation and future destiny of the individual or their meaning in relation to God's purpose for the race. The purpose of these accounts is not to satisfy our scientific or philosophical instinct but to develop within us the life of faith. These accounts are intended to bring us to a life of fuller obedience now and trust with reference to the future. They give us the assurance that the God of grace who now delivers us from the guilt and bondage of sin will bring us to a glorious destiny in fellowship with himself; they do not satisfy our curiosity with reference to the details of the future history of the human race or the development of the kingdom of God on earth, nor with reference to many things that concern the future life.

3. Sufficient knowledge of the future for religious ends. It is not correct to say that we know nothing of the future life. Agnosticism here is no more satisfactory than it is anywhere else in religion. But it must be recognized that our knowledge is limited. Prophecy is not history written beforehand. We have no such view of the future as that idea of prophecy would imply.

We do know enough about God and his dealings with men and we are told enough about coming events to know that the future of the race on earth and the future of the Christian beyond this life are both in the hands of God. We might sum up the purpose of eschatology as we have it in the Bible by saying that it should do three things for the Christian:

(1) In the first place, it should stimulate him to the highest, sanest, most spiritual living and to the most determined and far-reaching endeavor in the spread of Christianity among men and the development of the kingdom of God on earth.

(2) It should give the greatest comfort and peace with reference to our hope for the future life.

(3) It should give the fullest assurance that the future of the race on earth and the Christian's destiny for the next life are in the hands of God. Any eschatological doctrine that does not contribute to these three ends is somehow out of line with the teaching of the New Testament on the subject.

II. **Meaning and development of the kingdom of God.** We believe that the subject of eschatology can best be understood if treated in relation to the idea of the kingdom of God, especially if we remember that this kingdom is a kingdom of redemption. As already indicated, we must keep in mind that this life is a preparation for the next, and that in some real sense the next life is a continuation of this. God is working out a great purpose for the race, especially for his redeemed children. So far as the future is revealed to us, it is revealed as the development and consummation of the plan that God is working out in human history. Man's eternal destiny is to be the fruition of the moral and spiritual forces that are operative in time. This is clearly the view that is presented in the Bible. We will, therefore, treat the subject of eschatology in relation to the idea of the com-

ing of the kingdom or consummation of God's plan of redemption.

We need first to get before our minds the meaning and development of the idea of the kingdom of God. This term is used in a number of senses in the Bible.

1. The universal sovereignty of God. In the first place, it is used with reference to the sovereignty of God over the whole of creation and particularly over mankind. This is expressed in many ways in the Bible. In Ps. 47 : 2 we have this : "For Jehovah Most High is terrible ; he is a great King over all the earth." In verse 7 of the same psalm the thought is repeated and in verse 8 we find : "God reigneth over the nations ; God sitteth upon his holy throne." In Ps. 103 : 19 are these words : "Jehovah hath established his throne in the heavens ; And his kingdom ruleth over all." Again in verse 22 the writer says : "Bless Jehovah, all ye his works, In all places of his dominion." This universal sovereignty or rule of God is necessarily involved in the Biblical conception of God. There is only one true God, and he is sovereign over all the universe. He is everywhere present and has all power. He is infinite in wisdom and goodness. He reigns over the universe which he has created. All nations of men and individuals are subject to his moral law and must account to him for their deeds. He sends judgments on Egypt, Babylon, Phoenicia and the other nations as well as on Israel. There is no point in space or time, no member of the human race, no part of any man's life, that is not subject to his righteous rule.

2. The theocratic kingdom of Israel. Then there is the kingdom of Israel in the Old Testament. God had a purpose for the race which could be best worked out by choosing one man and his descendants as his peculiar people. This he did. He selected Abraham and entered into a covenant with him by virtue of which he and his descendants should possess the land of Canaan and should

be a blessing to the whole world.[1] This people was formed into a nation, and as an organized nation became God's covenant people on the basis of God's redemptive act in delivering them from the land of Egypt under the leadership of Moses. There was a still further development when the nation became a kingdom under the leadership, but over the protest, of the prophet Samuel. Samuel reminded the people that Jehovah was the true King of Israel and that they should be careful not to allow the human king to stand in the way of their loyalty and service to Jehovah.[2] The spiritual guidance of the nation came mainly from the prophets, God's specially called and Spirit-endued messengers, rather than from the wordly kings or the officially appointed priests.

3. The spiritual kingdom founded by Jesus. Jehovah promised David that his descendant should ascend his throne and reign forever.[3] This promise found its fulfillment in Christ. So did the kingdom of Israel find its fulfillment in the spiritual kingdom of God founded by Jesus. The Old Testament theocracy finds its whole significance in relation to the spiritual kingdom for which it was a providential preparation. When Jesus came to earth, he came as a Savior-King. The magi from the east worshiped him.[4] He was regarded as fulfilling the promise made to David.[5] The kingdom of God was instituted at his coming. This was the kingdom prophesied by Daniel.[6] Jesus and John both came preaching that the kingdom was at hand.[7] This kingdom was not a political, earthly kingdom such as the Jews expected the Messiah would institute, but it was the reign of God in the hearts of men. The Jews expected that the Messiah would drop down out of the skies with such great miraculous displays of power as would overawe his enemies, break the power of the Roman yoke and establish a great Jewish

[1]Gen. 12: 1-3.
[2]1 Sam. 8.
[3]2 Sam. 7: 12ff.
[4]Matt. 2: 11.
[5]Luke 1: 32, 33; Acts 2: 25-36.
[6]Daniel 2: 44.
[7]Matt. 3: 2; Mark 1: 15.

kingdom to rule over the earth. And when Jesus came "meek and riding upon an ass," saying that the kingdom of God did not come with outward display such as the world could see and be impressed with, but that it was an inner reality that only the twice-born could see and appreciate,[1] they rejected such a king and such a kingdom with scorn. Even the most spiritual of the disciples of Jesus did not appreciate the spiritual nature of the kingdom until after the death and resurrection of Jesus and the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost. Even on the occasion of the ascension of Jesus, they were still asking if he would at that time restore the kingdom to Israel,[2] evidently thinking of a restoration of the Davidic kingdom under the Messiah, but perhaps on a grander scale. Paul says that the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.[3] It is an inner spiritual experience and a present reality. John says that he is partaker with those to whom he writes in the tribulation and kingdom and patience which are in Jesus.[4] John states this as a present experience of his and theirs. If the tribulation and patience belonged to John and his fellow Christians in this life, so did the kingdom. The kingdom, then, is not put off to some future age for its beginning; it begins here and now. When men submit to the authority of Christ as Savior and Lord and by the indwelling Spirit know righteousness, peace and joy, they are in the kingdom of God.

It is sometimes said that there cannot be a kingdom without a king; and since the King is absent, the kingdom is not yet; the kingdom will not be until the King returns. It is true that there cannot be a kingdom without a king; but we do have the King present in the Spirit. He lives in the Christian.[5] He dwells in our hearts by faith.[6] No man is a Christian who does not submit to his

[1]Luke 17: 20, 21; John 3: 3.
[2]Acts 1: 6.
[3]Rom. 14: 17.
[4]Rev. 1: 9.
[5]John 6: 56; Gal. 2: 20.
[6]Eph. 3: 17.

spiritual authority. He is now both Lord and Christ.[1] The resurrection and ascension is, according to Peter, the fulfillment of the promise to David that his descendants should sit upon his throne.[2] The Jews could not reconcile a suffering Messiah with the idea of a reigning Messiah. Some Christian teachers have the same difficulty. Because the Jewish nation did not accept and proclaim Jesus as King, they say the kingdom age was postponed until the second advent. But Paul had truer insight. He understood that the universal spiritual authority of Jesus grew out of his humiliation and death.[3] Jesus is King in human hearts and lives because they surrender to his sacrificial love, manifested in the cross. His power is the power of sacrificial love. Jesus did not announce the kingdom of God as at hand and then have to change his program because of rejection by his own nation. The kingdom of God was initiated at his coming. He ushered in a reign of peace and righteousness when he came to save men from sin. He reconciles men to God and to each other. When the angels sang about peace on earth among men of good will, they were not singing a song altogether inopportune because at least two thousand years too early.

4. This kingdom as a progressive power in the world. The kingdom is presented in the New Testament as having a development during the present gospel age. The gospel age and the kingdom age are not to be contrasted as two things. The coming of Christ and his gospel initiated the kingdom; the preaching of the gospel is the means of developing the kingdom. The gospel of the kingdom is the gospel of salvation by the grace of God through faith in Jesus as a crucified and risen Redeemer. There are not two gospels, but one.

In Matthew 13 Jesus gave two parables to illustrate the growth of the kingdom—the parables of the mustard seed and of the leaven (verses 31-33). Starting from in-

[1]Acts 2: 36. [2]Acts. 2: 29-34. [3]Phil. 2: 9-11.

significant beginnings it is to become a mighty world-wide power. Some say that the parable of the leaven represents the leavening power of Christianity in the individual life, while the mustard seed teaches the spread of Christianity in the world at large. Whether this is true or not, it is true that Jesus meant to show that Christianity was to have a growth indefinitely great in the world. Just how great is to be the development, no one can tell. Evidently the kingdom of God is to become a mighty power in the world's life. Some object to taking the parable of the leaven as representing the development of the kingdom. They say that it represents the spread of evil in the "church." One reason given for this is that leaven never elsewhere represents good. Two things should be said in reply. One is that, if leaven did everywhere else represent evil, by no means would this prove that it could not represent the good here. A figurative term does not necessarily have the same meaning every time used. Another thing to remember is that leaven did not in the Old Testament always represent evil.[1] There are some passages in the Old Testament that seem to predict a universal reign of peace and righteousness, such as Ps. 46: 8, 9; Isa. 2: 2-4; 11: 6-9; Micah 4: 1-4. There are those who deride the idea that wars shall cease before the second advent of Christ. But it must be remembered that many things have come to pass that good people did not believe could come to pass. It is not a safe proposition to hold that what has not been done cannot be done, especially if we take God and his grace into the count.

But it is objected that there are predictions in the New Testament to show that the world will grow worse and worse until Christ comes. This, however, is a mistake. These passages, if examined in the light of the context, we think will usually be found to be speaking of evils arising during the writer's own day, against which he is

[1]See. Lev. 7: 13; 23: 17.

giving warning. They are not passages that can be taken as indicating an increasing predominance of evil for the gospel age as a whole. Such an interpretation of them is contrary to the genius of the gospel and the teaching of the Scriptures as a whole. Besides, such an interpretation cannot be reconciled with two thousand years of Christian history. Even zealous Christian men may speak deridingly of what Christianity has done for human society. But in spite of that the world is a much better place in which to live than it was when Jesus was born into it. Woman has been partially liberated, childhood respected and, to some extent, protected, human personality valued more highly; and all this because of Jesus and his saving work. Political, industrial and national ideals are being slowly, but surely, transformed. It is something that nations will now at least apologize for causing a war and try to shift the responsibility in public opinion on others. Great social evils are slowly being outlawed.

Another thing to keep in mind is that there may be in some respects a development of evil over against the development of the kingdom of God. Evil develops in opposition to the good. The subtlest and most dangerous forms of evil do not appear in the midst of heathen darkness. They appear as angels of light in the midst of gospel blessings. Evil tends to become more subtle and intense where gospel light is greatest. The book of Revelation seems to picture the struggle between sin and righteousness as being prolonged and assuming many different forms. Sin appears in myriad forms before it is finally vanquished. When put down in one form, it reappears in another. It is made clear in the parable of the tares[1] and in other places that sin will not be entirely overcome until Christ comes again at the end of the age when there will be a final separation of the good and the bad. Nevertheless our aim as Christians

[1]Matt. 13: 24ff.

should be to make every man on earth a Christian if possible and to bring every Christian into complete subjection to Christ. Our aim should be to bring the whole social order of the world under the sway of the principles of the gospel and the Spirit of Christ. If it be objected that this is an ideal that is impossible of attainment in this age, it might be well to remember that, although the ideal is impossible of attainment, yet Christ has commanded us to be perfect as the Father in heaven is perfect.[1] The great commission sets before us as high an ideal with reference to Christianizing the social order in which we live as does this command of Jesus with reference to individual Christian character. The command to pray that God's kingdom shall come and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven places before us the same high ideal and on us the same great obligation.

5. The eternal kingdom of God. It is made clear in the New Testament that the final stage of the kingdom is the eternal kingdom to be ushered in at the second coming of Christ. A good deal of confusion of thought appears at this point. Some insist that the kingdom age is yet to come, that it is to be ushered in at the second coming of Christ. But the New Testament makes it clear that the second coming does not usher in, but consummates, the kingdom of God on earth, and ushers in the eternal kingdom. The following passages make it clear that the word is used in this latter sense: Matt. 13: 43; 25: 34; 26: 29; 1 Cor. 15: 24; 2 Tim. 4: 1, 18. This phase of the matter will be discussed further in connection with the second coming of Christ.

The topics that follow may be considered as steps in the establishment of the eternal kingdom or aspects of that kingdom when established. Death, the second coming of Christ, the resurrection and the judgment are steps in the establishment of the eternal kingdom, while heaven and hell are aspects of the order of things when

[1]Matt. 5: 48.

God's authority and power shall have been established over all things.

III. **Death and immortal glory.**

1. We have already considered the fact that death is viewed in the Bible as the penalty of sin. We do not here need to treat the matter any further. But there is the fact that in the Old Testament death and the future life are generally given a rather gloomy aspect. The religion of the Hebrews was a religion mainly for this life. It is rather difficult for us to put ourselves in their place and realize that this is true, but nevertheless it is, as the Old Testament clearly shows. The promises were mainly for this life, and more largely than in the New Testament were connected with temporal good. Death at times was spoken of as the cessation of conscious communion with God and active service to him.[1] The continuance of life on earth was the mark of God's favor.[2] At times the writer seems to look beyond death to life with God, but even then the matter is not dwelt upon. It is simply asserted.[3] Only once or twice is resurrection clearly and definitely asserted.[4] The passage in Dan. 12: 1-3 is the only undisputed one. The one in Isaiah is almost as clear. The figurative use of the expression by Ezekiel shows that the idea was not unfamiliar.[5] The teaching of Peter,[6] of Paul,[7] and of Jesus[8] shows that they regarded the Old Testament as teaching the doctrine. The translation of Enoch and Elijah shows that the Old Testament writers did not regard death as the end of existence. We might sum up by saying that the Old Testament as a whole clearly does not regard death as the cessation of existence, but it does not give us much light on life beyond the grave.

[1]Ps. 6: 5; 30: 9; 88: 10-12; 115: 17; Eccl. 9: 10; Isa. 38: 18.
[2]Isa. 38: 18-20.
[3]Ps. 16: 8-11; 73: 24ff *et al.*
[4]Isa. 26: 19; Dan. 12: 2.
[5]Ezek. 37: 12ff.
[6]Acts 2: 25ff.
[7]Acts 13: 33.
[8]Mark 12: 24ff.

2. The remarkable thing is that in the New Testament all this is changed. The outlook upon death is completely transformed. This does not mean that death within itself has come to be regarded as a good; it rather means that the evil of death has been overcome and death is looked upon as the entrance for God's child upon a more glorious and a fuller life. Jesus calls death a sleep.[1] For this his enemies laughed him to scorn. He speaks of the death of Lazarus as a sleep.[2] This his disciples could not understand. He speaks of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as living, not dead.[3] In the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus Jesus shows that he does not regard death as the cessation of conscious existence, but for the righteous as the entrance upon a state of rest and peace.[4] Stephen is said to have fallen on sleep.[5] Paul names death as one of the things that cannot separate us from the love of God,[6] and again he includes it as among the Christian's possessions.[7] This last expression shows that Paul regards death as becoming, by God's grace, an asset rather than a liability, a blessing rather than a curse. In his own case he says that it would be far better to depart and be with the Lord; this is his desire for himself.[8] Later on when he thinks his time is about up, he quietly says that the time of his departure is at hand, henceforth there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness.[9]

3. What are the causes that have wrought this changed view of death? Leaving aside the theological development of the interbiblical period, we find in the New Testament itself the explanation. There are two primary reasons. One is the resurrection of Jesus; the other is the communion with God that came to men through faith in the crucified and risen Redeemer. The disciples had seen their hopes concerning Jesus as the Messiah dashed to pieces by his cruel death upon the

[1]Mark 5: 39. [2]John 11: 11. [3]Mark 12: 26, 27. [4]Luke 16: 19ff. [5]Acts 7: 60. [6]Rom. 8: 38. [7]1 Cor. 3: 21, 22. [8]Phil. 1: 23. [9]2 Tim. 4: 6, 8.

cross at the hands of sinful men. But their hopes were revived by his resurrection from the dead, and their conception of his Messiahship and the nature of his kingdom transformed. The resurrection also wrought a transformation in their view of death. They had before them a living demonstration of the fact that death had been conquered. They interpreted the death and resurrection of Jesus to mean that he had dealt with the two great problems of human life. He died for our sins according to the Scriptures.[1] In his death he met the problem of sin and solved it. He struggled with it as man's greatest enemy and conquered it. In conquering sin he conquered death, for sin and death are inseparable. The other side of the matter is that by faith in Christ men came into fellowship with the living God and thereby had conscious victory over sin and death in their own lives. They were conscious that the fellowship they had with God was one that death could not terminate. The power of sin and death had been broken in their lives by the incoming of a new power, the power of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.[2] Christ came and took the nature of man that through death he might deliver all those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.[3]

4. Instead, then, of death being something to be dreaded, it is the hour of deliverance for the Christian, the hour of entrance into a more glorious life. Death is not the termination of life, it is the entrance upon a larger life. The main element in this larger life is that it is to be a life of continued fellowship with the Lord. That was the thing to which Paul looked forward with eager longing.[4] Death is the means, then, by which we are translated into the "upper and better kingdom."

IV. **The final advent of Christ.** There has been, and is yet, great diversity of opinion in regard to the return

[1]1 Cor. 15: 3.
[2]Rom. 8: 2.
[3]Heb. 2: 14-16.
[4]2 Cor. 5: 1ff; Phil. 1: 23.

of Christ to earth. A question on which there is so much difference of view among earnest Christian men ought to be one in which there is a tolerant spirit manifested, and one that is approached with due caution and reserve of judgment. One should not be too dogmatic where it is evidently so easy to miss the way; and when one has pronounced convictions he should have due respect for good and earnest brethren who hold opposite opinions. Yet one should not, because of the great diversity of opinion in regard to the matter and the great difficulty of the subject, be deterred from investigating the subject and coming to a positive conclusion in regard to the main features of the question. This the writer has tried to do, and, if at any point he has not manifested due tolerance toward those who differ with him, he asks for a charitable judgment at their hands.

We wish now to consider some of the more fundamental features of this doctrine as presented in the New Testament and set forth some conclusions which we believe can be safely held on the question.

1. The fact of his return. The New Testament teaches beyond question that Christ will return to earth. Perhaps no one who studies the New Testament would deny that the disciples expected him to return. There are some, however, who would deny that Jesus himself promised such a return. But the only grounds on which such a position can be maintained are either that the disciples utterly misunderstood Jesus or that the New Testament records are entirely unreliable on this point. Either the disciples misunderstood Jesus and thus misrepresent him in their reports in the Gospel records, or else these records came from those who were so far removed from Jesus that they do not correctly represent him. Neither of these hypotheses can be accepted, if we are to put any dependence in the New Testament. If these records so utterly misrepresent the mind of Jesus on this point, how can we trust them at all with refer-

ence to his life and teaching? This we say because the promise of his return is one of the outstanding things in his teaching. The following references will make it clear that the fact of Christ's return to earth is a fundamental teaching in the New Testament: Matt. 16: 27; 24: 27, 37-39; 25: 31; Mark 8: 38; 13: 26; Luke 21: 27; John 21: 22; Acts 1: 11; 1 Cor. 15: 23; 1 Thess. 1: 10; 4: 16; 2 Thess. 1: 7, 10; 2: 1, 8; 1 Peter 1: 7; 2 Peter 1: 16; 3: 4, 8-12; 1 John 2: 28. This list is by no means exhaustive, but it is representative. Some people might question a few of these as referring to the final advent, but about them as a whole there can be no question. All classes of writers in the New Testament, early and late, evidently looked forward to the return of Christ, and regarded this hope as based on a promise of Christ himself, before he went away.

2. The nature of his manifestation. Another thing that appears from the above references, and from others that might be cited, is that the nature of this return is to be a personal, manifest, universal revelation of himself. That there are to be other manifestations of Christ before the great day we would grant and even insist; but we would also insist that these do not take the place of, nor render unnecessary, this final manifestation of Christ. This final manifestation of Christ is not to be identified with the inner revelation of his glory now in our hearts. That is something that is inner, secret and hence not manifest to the world. The coming of Christ at the end of the age will be open and manifest to the whole world. This is represented by such expressions as that he will come on the clouds,[1] accompanied by the holy angels,[2] that he shall descend with a shout, the voice of the archangel and the sound of a trumpet.[3] While some of these might be taken as figurative expressions, they at least signify that his appearing will be no inner secret affair known only to a few, but that it will be

[1]Matt. 24: 30.
[2]Matt. 25: 31.
[3]1 Thess. 4: 16; 1 Cor. 15: 52.

open and manifest to the whole world. This will become more evident in connection with the next topic.

3. The purpose of his coming. For what purpose is Christ coming back to the earth? This question is of the greatest importance in relation to this doctrine, and we are bound to say that we think it is where many good people miss the way. Perhaps we can sum the matter up in the following statements:

(1) Christ is not to return to save the world, but to judge it. The primary purpose of his first coming was to save the world, not to judge it.[1] He came the first time in humility. He was rejected and crucified. But when he comes again, he comes in glory and power. He does come on a saving mission, but it will be a saving mission only to those who have received him before he comes. He will raise the dead and transform the living Christians, and thus complete their salvation.[2] But no sinner will repent after he comes. His coming to judge the world is a motive to repentance now, but it will offer no opportunity for repentance after he comes.[3] To hold that Christ is now saving a small remnant of the race, the elect, the church, the bride of Christ, and that he will save the great majority of mankind after he returns and overawes the world with a manifestation of his majesty and power—this is practically to give us two plans of salvation. One is the plan of salvation by moral suasion, spiritual power and gospel influences; the other is the plan of so impressing the world with an outward demonstration of majesty and power that the world will be compelled to submit. There is no such plan as the latter. Every sinner that is saved must be saved by the former method. There is not a shadow of hope held out in the New Testament that any sinner will ever be saved after the present age comes to an end. No amount of outward manifestation of power will change the will of man. This might lead him to give external

[1]John 3: 17; 12: 47. [2]1 Cor. 15: 50ff; 1 Thess. 4: 13ff.
[3]Acts 17: 30ff.

and professed submission as a matter of slavish fear, but it would not restore the moral nature of the sinner. The weapon by which the world is to be subdued is the gospel of Christ, preached by sinners saved by God's grace and endued by his Spirit for their task. If that plan fails, God has no other that he has revealed to man. It is the Christ out of whose mouth proceeds the sharp, two-edged sword of the word of God that goes forth to make war on sin and unrighteousness and drive them from the earth.[1] His agents are the poor, divided, erring churches such as we see in Rev. 2 and 3, and such as we see in the world today, together with their messengers. The ground of our confidence is not in the churches, nor the messengers, but in the Christ who walks in the midst of the candlesticks and holds the seven stars in his right hand.[2] He will not fail, even in the use of such poor agencies. Paul gives us to understand that Christ is to stay on the throne of his mediatorial kingdom until all his enemies are put beneath his feet.[3] When he comes that throne, his mediatorial work, so far as saving sinners is concerned, will be ended. Then comes judgment, not salvation, for the sinner. Peter seems to teach that the reason the Lord delays his coming is because he does not wish that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.[4] He delays that men may have an opportunity to repent.

(2) He comes, not to establish a temporal kingdom on earth, but to consummate the mediatorial kingdom and usher in the eternal kingdom of God. At the incarnation of God and as the One who had wrought redemption for man by his death and resurrection, Christ was given supreme authority over the human race.[5] This authority had special reference to the salvation of men and looked toward that end.[6] This authority is one day to be universally recognized and owned.[7] It will

[1]Rev. 1: 16. [2]Rev. 1: 12, 16, 20. [3]1 Cor. 15: 25. [4]2 Peter 3: 9. [5]Matt. 28: 18. [6]John 17: 2. [7]Phil. 2: 10, 11.

continue until the last enemy of his in the world is subdued, which is to be death.[1] This conquering of death will take place at the second coming, when Christ will raise his people from the dead.[2] Then he will deliver up the kingdom to the Father.[3] Perhaps this last statement means that the work of redemption is now accomplished, and so far as that work is concerned, he gives the kingdom back to the Father. He brings the redeemed race with himself back into submission to God, and, since his work in that respect is finished, he surrenders his commission and authority back to God who gave them. But the fact that the conquering of death in the raising of his people at his coming is expressly stated here to be the last enemy to be conquered—this shows that the resurrection of the saints at Christ's coming to earth is the consummation, not the initiation of his kingdom, and is the ushering in of the eternal kingdom of God. This absolutely precludes any literal reign of a thousand years, or of any other length, on the earth after Christ comes. His coming is the consummation, not the initiation, of his kingdom in time. The historical order ends when Christ returns to earth.

(3) The fact that Christ comes to raise the dead and judge the world has been referred to. Both these will be discussed later on. But there are certain passages that seem to give a cosmic significance to Christ's coming. Peter indicates that the present order will pass away and there will be new heavens and a new earth.[4] John saw new heavens and a new earth.[5] Paul indicates that the creation was subjected to vanity, perhaps because of man's sin. Man groans within himself waiting for his adoption, the redemption of his body. So does the whole creation groan waiting to share the liberty of the glory of the sons of God.[6] This would be the counterpart of what is said in Genesis 3: 17-19 about a curse

[1] 1 Cor. 15: 24-26.
[2] 1 Cor. 15: 23.
[3] 1 Cor. 15: 24.
[4] 2 Peter 3: 12, 13.
[5] Rev. 21: 1.
[6] Rom. 8: 19-23.

coming upon nature because of man's sin. Some of these statements may be figurative and symbolical of moral and spiritual realities, but they indicate at least the possibility of the renewal of the physical world along with the redemption of man.

(4) There seem to be three outstanding points in God's dealings with humanity in Christ. The first was creation, when human history began. The second was the incarnation, when the recreation of the race in Christ as the head of a redeemed humanity began. The third will be the second coming, when the history of the race in time comes to an end, when redemption is consummated and the eternal order of things is ushered in.

We can see why it is in the New Testament, then, that the second coming of Christ is the one outstanding event of the future toward which everything else points, just as in the Old Testament the first coming of the Messiah was the great event looked forward to. The second coming of Christ is the glorious hope for the Christian.

4. The time of his coming. There is no place where greater wisdom is needed than in discussing this phase of the second coming.

(1) Two things we cannot do. There are two things it seems clear that we cannot do. One is to fix the time for the second coming of Christ. Jesus said that he himself did not know the time and that no one did know except the Father.[1] Paul rejected the inference from his own teaching that he was fixing the time as immediately at hand.[2] Jesus warns us against those who would point out the time and place of the appearance of the Messiah.[3] He says that his appearing will be sudden and unexpected like a flash of lightning.[4] He will come unexpectedly on the world like the flood in the days of Noah.[5] This is the point, and the only point, in his illustration of the flood. It has no reference to the moral condition of the world at the time of his coming.

[1]Mark 13: 32. [3]Matt. 24: 23ff. [5]Matt. 24: 37ff.
[2]2 Thess. 2: 1ff. [4]Matt. 24: 27.

All efforts at fixing the time of his coming through two thousand years of history have failed. But some people do not seem able to learn much from two thousand years of history.

But the question may be asked, does not Jesus give the lesson of the fig tree and tell his disciples that when they see certain signs to know that the time is at hand? Yes; and he says in the very next verse that that generation should not pass away until all those things were fulfilled.[1] All three of the Synoptic Gospels report the illustration, followed by the saying that it applied to that generation. Anyone now living who belonged to that generation might take the saying to himself; others should be cautious. Discussion of the signs of the times is rather a dubious exercise. One may be able often to show a good deal of ingenuity in manipulating sacred numbers and mysterious signs, but small profit usually comes to the hearer or reader. Besides, one may take any particular period of human history and find most any certain set of tendencies for which he is looking, especially if he is allowed to draw on his own imagination and is not under the necessity of paying too much attention to facts.

This brings us to the other thing we cannot do; namely, to fix plans and programs of human history. The Bible is not intended to give us such a foresight of the development of history. All such efforts are in vain. It does seem to be made fairly clear in the New Testament that the second coming of Christ will wind up the affairs of human history; so that we seem to be safe in saying that whatever is to come in the way of the conversion of the Jews, the revelation of the man of sin (more than has already taken place), the triumphs of Christianity in the world—all this will be before the final advent, not after. It is because the writer does not believe any scheme of history can be made out be-

[1]Matt. 24: 32-34; Mark 13: 28-30; Luke 21: 29-32.

forehand that he leaves to one side the question of the millennium. The Bible refers to the millennium in only one obscure passage and nobody seems to know what it means.[1] It is also to be noted that nothing is said in the passage about the second coming of Christ. The writer does believe whatever triumphs of Christianity are to come must come before the final advent, and that there will probably be great triumphs of the gospel and its principles in human history. To that extent he is a post-millennialist.

(2) Is the coming of Christ imminent? In the teaching of many, great emphasis is laid on the idea of the imminence of the coming of Christ: that is, the idea that his coming may take place at any time. It is said that the New Testament teaches the imminence of his coming and that the value of the doctrine of the second coming depends on it. It is said that the value of the doctrine as an incentive to holy living and Christian activity is lost unless the coming of Christ may be expected at any time. This is perhaps the most difficult phase of this question. Let us look at it to see if we can come to a satisfactory conclusion.

a. In the first place, what did Jesus teach his disciples concerning the time of his return? Jesus did teach his disciples that certain things would take place during that generation.[2] But he must have been referring to the fall of Jerusalem, the transfiguration, Pentecost and possibly other such events. He solemnly affirms in some of these passages that heaven and earth shall pass away, but his words shall not pass away.[3] This solemn statement of Jesus would not be true if he had predicted his return in that generation, since it did not take place. Besides, in this same connection Jesus said that only the Father knew the time of his return.[4] What Jesus seems to say, then, is that there are some things that he is telling them about that will come to pass dur-

[1]Rev. 20: 1-10.
[2]Matt. 24: 32-34 and parallels.
[3]Matt. 24: 34.
[4]Matt. 24: 36.

ing that generation; but lest they should think that he means his return to earth he puts in a warning word to the effect that he himself does not know the time of his return, and he says that no one knows but the Father. So if any man claims to know he contradicts Jesus on that point. And, as already pointed out, Jesus indicates that his coming will be sudden and unexpected.[1] Moreover, there are indications in the teaching of Jesus that he did not expect to return immediately. In the parable of the ten virgins he said: "While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept."[2] He said in the parable of the talents: "After a long time the lord of those servants cometh."[3] One thing, then, we can count as settled; that is, that Jesus did not teach that he would return soon, nor did any of his teaching imply that he expected to return soon.

b. Did the apostles expect Jesus to return during their lifetime? Many of their statements make that impression. This seems to be generally agreed upon by New Testament students; yet many New Testament interpreters have placed an undue emphasis on this idea. Probably all that we are justified in saying in that direction is that the New Testament Christians regarded it as possible that Jesus would come back during their lifetime. Such seems to be implied in Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 15: 51: "We all shall not sleep, but we shall all be changed." We must remember, however, that there is a difference between affirming that Jesus would come during their lifetime and assuming the attitude that his coming was a possibility. The first would need to be based on definite knowledge as to the time of his return; the latter is based on a conscious ignorance as to the time of his coming.

There is another distinction that needs to be noted. When New Testament writers are speaking of the coming of Christ without reference to intervening events,

[1]Matt. 24: 37ff. [2]Matt. 25: 5. [3]Matt. 25: 19.

they speak of it as an event that looms large and often seems to be near. This is doubtless due to the fact that the second coming is the great event of the future for Christians and for the kingdom of God. It is like looking at a great mountain peak that rises above the surrounding plain through a clear, rarefied atmosphere. It rises so high above surrounding and intervening objects that it appears to be near. When one begins to move over the intervening territory and view the peak in relation to intervening objects, it is seen to be much farther away than it seemed at first sight. Something like this seems to be true with reference to the second coming of Christ. When the New Testament writers are looking at that event with reference to its meaning to themselves, it seems to their hearts, eager and longing for a restoration of face-to-face fellowship with him, to be near. But when they look at his coming with reference to intervening events, they affirm that it is not immediately at hand. When Paul was reported as teaching that the Lord was immediately at hand, he denied it and said that the Lord would not immediately appear. The man of sin must first be revealed.[1] When the report went out that Jesus had said to Peter that the beloved disciple should not die, but remain until Jesus returned, that disciple corrected the report.[2] Some think that he added the twenty-first chapter of his Gospel after coming to a close in chapter twenty, for the purpose of making that correction. Some say that the apostles expected Jesus to return during their lifetime. If Peter did, he must have disregarded what Jesus told him, for Jesus told him by what manner of death he should glorify God.[3] Paul, in his old age at least, expected to die.[4]

It hardly represents the situation correctly, then, to say that the New Testament writers spoke of the second coming as imminent in the strict sense of the word;

[1]2 Thess. 2: 1ff.
[2]John 21: 18ff.
[3]John 21: 18, 19.
[4]Phil. 1: 21-24; 2 Tim. 4: 6ff.

that is, as liable to occur at any time. Paul expressly repudiated the idea, as shown above; while Peter and John knew that Peter was to die. It does seem true that, under what one might call an impressionist view, the second coming seemed near, due to the tremendous significance of the event. Doubtless other things that contributed to this view, along with the importance of the event, was their desire to see Jesus again in objective vision and the fact that the time of his return was concealed from them. After considerable delay, when Jesus did not return and people began to become sceptical about the matter, Peter falls back on the principle that a day is with the Lord as a thousand years.[1] That is, he says that God does not hurry as man does. He takes his time. Christ will return, for God is not slack concerning his promise. His delay does not mean his failure. It means rather that God is delaying because he wants to give men more time to repent. Christ will return and that when men are not looking for him.

One might say, then, that in the New Testament, when the writers saw the second coming through their eager desire to see Jesus again and in relation to the meaning of his coming to themselves, it seemed near. But when seen in relation to intervening events and the salvation of sinners, it seemed to recede. This is not a false impression, for the only opportunity that any man has to prepare for the Lord's coming is now. The time is brief. One must prepare before death comes. It is now or never. Consequently so far as individual preparation and readiness are concerned the second coming is near; so far as the history of the world and the coming of the kingdom of God are concerned, it may be millenniums away.

Some people insist, however, that unless we can say that Christ may come any minute, we lose the value of

[1]2 Peter 3: 1ff.

the doctrine as a motive to holy living. As a matter of fact, Jesus never urges the nearness of his coming as such a motive. He does urge the uncertainty of the time as such a motive.[1] The certainty of his coming, together with the uncertainty and brevity of time to prepare for it, does constitute a valid appeal to holy living, and this can be urged on any view as to the time of his coming. The man who says that it is the imminence of the final advent that makes it an incentive to holy living will preach on the judgment, urge its certainty and the uncertainty and brevity of time for preparation as a motive to repentance and holy living, when, according to his own view, the final judgment must be at least a thousand years in the future. In the New Testament the second coming and the judgment are put on a par in this respect.[2] On the other hand, Christian history shows conclusively that a strong emphasis on the idea of the imminence of the Lord's coming, not only may promote fanaticism, but will almost certainly promote a form of Christian activity that emphasizes evangelism of a type that is not any too thorough and overlooks other forms of Christian activity that are just as essential to carrying out the full commission of Jesus and necessary to the building of a Christian civilization.

V. **Resurrection.**

1. Only one resurrection. The teaching of the Bible is that there will be one general resurrection, at the time of the second coming of Christ, including the righteous and unrighteous. The statement of Daniel is that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."[3] Here both the righteous and the wicked are included in the resurrection. Jesus says that the hour comes in which all that

[1]Matt. 24: 44. [2]See James 5: 8, 9. [3]Dan. 12: 2.

are in the tombs shall hear the voice of the Son of God and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment or condemnation.[1] Luke reports Paul as saying that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust.[2] In the account of the judgment found in Rev. 20: 11ff, it is said that the sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them (vs. 13). While not spoken of as a resurrection, this evidently means a resurrection of all the dead. The Biblical conception of the resurrection is that it will be a universal resurrection, including the righteous and the wicked. The impression from these passages is that all the dead are raised at the same time. There is not a suggestion in any of them that there is to be an interval of time between the resurrection of the righteous and of the wicked.

There are two objections to the above conclusion. One is based on the idea that there will be no resurrection of the unjust, but only of the just. But to hold this position we must assume that the Fourth Gospel has wrongly reported Jesus and the Acts wrongly reported Paul; because in the above named passages Jesus and Paul are both quoted as asserting that the wicked as well as the righteous will be raised. But to set aside these words reported as those of Jesus and Paul we would need some better reason than the fact that they do not agree with one's conception that there is to be no resurrection of the unjust. This seems to be the ground on which these reports are usually set aside. So far as Jesus is concerned, he abundantly teaches in other places the punishment of the wicked in the future life. This would seem to carry with it their resurrection. As to Paul, it is sometimes urged that he elsewhere teaches the resurrection of the righteous but nowhere else says

[1]John 5: 28, 29. [2]Acts 24: 15.

anything about the resurrection of the wicked. But this can easily be accounted for on the ground that elsewhere, e. g., in 1 Cor. 15, the resurrection of the unrighteous does not come within the range of his discussion. The fact that he does not mention it is no reason for saying that he did not believe in it, especially in view of what Luke reports him as saying in Acts.

Another objection is based on the view that there will be two resurrections, one of the righteous at the coming of Christ at the beginning of the millennium, the other of the wicked at the close of the millennium. This view is based on the supposition that the first resurrection spoken of in Rev. 20: 1-10 is a literal, bodily resurrection. But in the first place, it should be noted that whatever is meant by this first resurrection, it is not said that it includes all the righteous, but only those who "had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and such as worshiped not the beast, neither his image, and received not the mark upon their forehead and upon their hand" (vs. 4).

In the next place, it must be remembered that this is a highly figurative passage in the most highly figurative book in the Bible. Therefore it is unsafe to make this passage our criterion for interpreting the resurrection. Other plain passages seem to teach one general resurrection. It is much safer to interpret this passage in accord with those plain passages than to try to make them fit in with a literal interpretation of this. That the resurrection is sometimes spoken of in a figurative sense is shown in Ezekiel's vision[1] and by the saying of Jesus in John 5: 25. Some interpret this first resurrection to mean a revival of the cause and principles for which the martyrs died: others that it refers to their exaltation to a higher life at the time of their death. But whatever it means, this passage can not be made a criterion for determining our doctrine of the resurrection.

[1]Ch. 37.

Besides, some premillennialists hold that during the millennium many will be saved and die. Then we would have to have a third resurrection for the saved who die during that priod.

So we believe that the New Testament teaching is that there will be one general resurrection of all the dead at the same time.

2. The time of the resurrection. We have already cited several passages to show that there will be one general resurrection of the dead. These passages do not definitely locate the resurrection at the time of the second coming of Christ. But there are other passages that do. In 1 Cor. 15 Paul puts the resurrection of Christians at the time of the second coming. This is made clear in verse 23. They that are Christ's at his coming are to be made alive. If any one should suggest that this is the resurrection only of the just and that the resurrection of the unjust will come a thousand years later, this is absolutely precluded by Paul's next statement, which is that, "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father" (vs. 24). The last enemy to be conquered is death, in the resurrection (vs. 26). This takes place as the consummation of Christ's reign, not its inauguration (vs. 25).

We find also in 1 Thess. 4: 16 that the resurrection is to take place at the second coming. The dead shall rise when Christ descends from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God. Rev. 20: 11-15 identifies in time the resurrection and the judgment, while Matt. 25: 31ff places the judgment at the time of the second coming. These three events then seem to come together; the second coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the judgment.

There are those who maintain that the Christian comes into possession of his resurrection body immediately upon death. But to do this one must deny that there is

any resurrection of the body. The resurrection, according to this view, means, not that the body laid in the tomb is raised to immortal life and glory, but that this body is shed at death, as the snake sheds his old skin, and that it is replaced by a higher, spiritual organism. It is said, for instance, that Paul does not in 1 Cor. 15 teach a bodily resurrection, but a *resurrection body*.[1] We do not believe, however, that this represents Paul. Paul does teach there a resurrection of the body. Paul's argument in verse 35ff is based on the supposition that it is the body that is buried in the earth that is raised. His illustration of sowing the grain of wheat implies that the new body is vitally connected with the old. Notice especially what he says in verses 40-44. The body that is sown is the body that is raised, though transformed and glorified.

The only passage in Paul's writings that seems to teach the other view is 2 Cor. 5: 1-10. Here the Apostle seems, at first sight, to be speaking of receiving the resurrection body immediately upon death in contrast to living in the body here. And if we did not have other passages, such as 1 Cor. 15 and 1 Thess. 4: 13-18, that show unmistakably that he taught that the resurrection will take place at the second coming, we would get this impression from the passage. But certainly Paul would not in 1 Corinthians teach the one view and then so soon after in 2 Corinthians teach the other. Therefore, if Paul's teaching is to be harmonized, it must be on the basis that the resurrection takes place at the second coming. The most natural explanation seems to be that in 2 Cor. 5 he has in view the resurrection body, and has it in vivid anticipation in contrast to the present body of humiliation. For the present he disregards the intermediate state between death and resurrection. Possibly Paul's thought of Christ's return as near (with the

[1]See "The Other Side of Death," by Ronald G. MacIntyre, Ch. VIII.

resurrection) may have something to do with the way he speaks in 2 Cor. 5: 1ff. He may be thinking of the second coming and resurrection as being so near that the time between the death of any Christian then living and the resurrection is in his thought practically negligible. It is also a possibility that, for the Apostle's mind, the categories of time are transcended when we enter the higher life at death, so that for all practical purposes the resurrection might be regarded as present for the individual Christian at death. Looking at the matter, however, from the point of view of the historical order, one argument for the view that the resurrection takes place at the second coming is that it shows that the individual Christian does not come into final possession of the glories of the eternal order apart from the completion of the kingdom of God and the consummation of God's redemptive plan for the race as a whole.

3. Nature of the resurrection body. Not a great deal is said in the New Testament about the nature of the resurrection body. Some light is thrown upon the subject, however, from two sources. One is the resurrection and appearances of Jesus; the other is such teachings as we find in 1 Cor. 15 and in Jesus' teaching in his controversy with the Sadducees on this question.[1] With these as a basis, we feel safe in taking the following positions:

(1) It will be a body. The resurrection does not stand simply for the immortality of man's spiritual nature or soul. It carries with it the fact of immortality, but means more than that. The fact that Jesus ate before the disciples after the resurrection, that he walked and talked with them, shows that he was more than a spirit. In fact Jesus repudiated the idea that he was such a spirit, saying that he had flesh and bones.[2] On another occasion they took hold of his feet and worshiped him.[3]

[1]Mark 12: 18-27. [2]Luke 24: 39. [3]Matt. 28: 9.

Besides, the body of Jesus came out of the tomb. The tomb was found empty.[1] When Paul speaks of a spiritual body,[2] he does not mean a body that is simply spirit in essence. Such would not be a body at all. Our eternal state will not be that of a disembodied spirit, but our spirits will be clothed and objectified in a body.

(2) It will grow out of, and be a continuation of, the present body. As already pointed out, Paul teaches in 1 Cor. 15 that the body that is planted in the grave will rise again. It was the body of Jesus that was laid in Joseph's tomb which rose and in which he appeared to his disciples.

It is sometimes objected to this that it will be impossible to gather together all the particles of matter that belong to the present body and reunite them in the resurrection body. Sometimes a particle of matter may belong to more than one human body. The answer to this objection is that the continuous identity of the body does not depend on its possessing the same particles of matter continuously. Every particle of matter in one's body is supposed to change every few years. Yet there is continuous identity. The body of the mature man is continuous with the body of the infant. Yet the particles of matter have changed. So have the size, features and other characteristics changed to such an extent that no one who has not known the person during the intervening period would recognize the body of the man as having any identity with that of the child. The principle of continuity does not seem to reside in the particles of matter composing the body; it is probably in the life that animates the body. This may suggest the appropriateness of Paul's figure of the grain of wheat that is planted in the ground and dies. So the body is planted, and out of the old body comes a new one with higher powers, and yet it is continuous with the old.

[1]John 20: 11, 12. [2]1 Cor. 15: 44.

(3) The new body has higher powers than the old. This is evident in the case of the body of Jesus. He seemed to come through closed doors at will.[1] At the time of the ascension his body moved through space. Possibly our resurrection bodies will largely transcend the limitations of space as those limitations belong to matter as we now know it. Paul calls the resurrection body a spiritual body. As pointed out already, this does not mean a body composed of spirit, but one perfectly adapted to the ends and uses of our glorified spirits. Paul says that flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God.[2] Some interpret this to mean that the resurrection body will not be composed of matter but spirit. This would not agree with the statement of Jesus that his resurrection body was flesh and bone The context shows that Paul's statement rather means flesh and blood as we now know them, subject to corruption and decay. Corruption, decay and death will be done away with, and our resurrection bodies will be immortal, incorruptible, and glorious. As to the definite respects in which its powers will transcend those of the present body we are not told.

(4) As to the nature of the resurrection body of the wicked, we are left almost entirely in the dark. About all that we learn is the fact that the wicked are raised and that they rise to a resurrection of shame and condemnation. Possibly in some ways their bodies will conform to their depraved and deformed spirits, but we are not told; and where nothing is revealed and we have no suggestions in experience as to which way to go, we had better practice a reverent silence.

VI. **The judgment.**

1. The certainty of judgment. The principle of judgment in God's dealings with man runs all the way through the Bible and through human experience and

[1]John 20: 26. [2]1 Cor. 15: 50.

history. The fact of judgment is involved in man's moral freedom and in his responsibility to God. Judgment is not wholly deferred to the future. No man can do either good or evil without reaping immediately a reward of good or evil in accordance with his deed. Perhaps it could not be otherwise under a reign of moral law. And yet we can see that it would probably interfere with man's freedom, at least to some extent, if every deed were immediately followed by its due reward, especially if such a result were open and manifest. Man would follow the right course then, not so much because he loved the right and hated the wrong, as because he feared to do the wrong. Such an arrangement would hardly be one of moral freedom and discipline, but rather one of coercion. Much of our moral discipline and spiritual development we now get out of loyalty to right in face of the fact that right often seems to go unrewarded and sin unpunished. Such rewards as do follow the doing of right or wrong are often of such a nature as not to be evident to the world. Many times they consist in the approval or the disapproval of our own consciences. The full reward of our deeds does not follow immediately upon the commission of a deed right or wrong, nor is such reward as does follow immediately fully evident to the world. Such an arrangement as we have in this life seems to be necessary in a world designed as a place of moral discipline and probation.

The Scriptures are full of examples showing how God bestows his blessing upon the individual or nation that does right or his curse upon the one that does evil. This is especially evident in such periods of judgment as the flood, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the deliverance of Israel from Egypt with judgments upon Egypt, and the Babylonian captivity of the Jews. In the history of the Jews we have another outstanding example in the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. We

have the prophecy of this in the New Testament but not the record of its fulfillment. Jesus foretold this coming destruction upon the Jewish nation as a judgment for their rejection of him as the Messiah and God's Son.

In the Old Testament the emphasis is upon judgment in this life; in the New Testament final judgment is postponed until the next life. Final judgment does not come until the final advent of Christ. This is clearly shown in Matthew 25. It may be that final judgment is postponed until the end of human history in order that our deeds of good and evil may have time to work themselves out in human history to their final consequences. All our deeds will then have had plenty of time to manifest themselves in their moral quality in their effects upon the lives of others. Every man will then be judged, not as an isolated individual, but as a member of the race. The race in its unity and totality, as well as the individual units of the race, will be judged. God will be vindicated in his work of creating the race and in his providential direction and redemption of it. The judgment comes at the end of the history of the race on earth and as the consummation of that history.

There is no contradiction, then, between the idea of partial judgment in God's dealings with individuals, with nations and the race during the course of history, and the idea of a final judgment at the end of human history. The latter comes as the completion and vindication of the former. Each implies the other and neither would be complete without the other.

2. The purpose of the judgment. The purpose of the judgment is not to institute an investigation to determine whether or not the individual will be saved or lost. The God of infinite wisdom and knowledge needs no such court of investigation. Known unto him are all

man's ways, man's character, man's destiny, without any such court of inquiry. Nor is it necessary in order that the man himself shall know what his destiny is. This is known to each man at death, if not sooner. Death itself is doubtless a great crisis of judgment in which character is manifested and crystalized, when one comes into the immediate presence of God. But in spite of this, it seems that there is still necessity for a final judgment at the end of human history.

What, then, is the purpose of the judgment? We might sum it up as follows:

(1) To bring out into the light each man's character as revealed in his words and deeds in relation to his fellowman, and in the effects of his deeds upon the lives of others. Perhaps this is the reason final judgment does not come until the end of human history at the second coming of Christ. The purpose of the judgment is not to weigh over against each other a man's good and bad deeds and determine his destiny according as the good or the bad preponderates. But his words and deeds are brought into the judgment as indicating his character. Character determines destiny and character is indicated and determined by deeds.

(2) To assign one a destiny in accordance with his character. As just stated this does not mean that one must wait until the judgment to know whether he is saved or lost. Nor does it mean that one does not enter upon the enjoyment of the fruits of a good life or the suffering of the evil consequences of a bad life immediately upon death. The teaching of the New Testament is to the contrary. But it does mean that the final and complete possession of such rewards for good or evil does not come until the end of time and the consummation of the historical order. Man does not come to his final destiny this side of the second coming of Christ

and the judgment. Each man comes to his final destiny along with every other member of the race.

(3) It is, then, to bring the affairs of human history to completion and vindicate God's dealings with the race as well as his dealings with the individual. If it were only to assign the individual, strictly speaking as an individual, his destiny in accordance with character, then the judgment might possibly not be a necessity. But God created man as a race, not as isolated individuals; the race as a race fell in the sin of the first man; God provided redemption for the race in the last Adam; he preserves and governs the race in him; and he will judge the race at his final manifestation. It is especially stressed in the New Testament that the judgment is to be universal.[1] All men will be there, and the affairs of the race in its history in time on the earth will be consummated. God's ways with man will be vindicated.

3. The ground of the judgment. The ground of the judgment is the fact that man is responsible to God as the Author of the world and of man's being. Man is responsible to God, because God creates and preserves him in existence and gives him all that he has in life. He lives in God's world. God is the ground and support of our being. "In him we live and move and have our being."[2] As free, man can choose or reject God and his service. To him, therefore, we are accountable for our lives.

The question is sometimes raised as to whether the judgment will be on a basis of law or of grace. It might be put in the form of an objection or difficulty. If man is saved by grace, how can he be judged on a basis of works? For instance, is Paul consistent with himself when he teaches that man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law[3] and when he teaches that God in the judgment will render to every man according to his

[1]Matt. 25: 32; Rom. 14: 10; Rev. 20: 13.
[2]Acts 17: 28.
[3]Rom. 3: 28.

works?[1] In consistency with this objection, it sometimes held that the Christian will not be judged; it is said that he has passed out from under judgment and, therefore, the judgment will only be for the unsaved. This is a misunderstanding of the sayings of Jesus. He does teach that the one who believes is not under judgment in the sense of condemnation and will never come again under condemnation.[2] He does not mean that the believer is no longer accountable to God, nor does he mean that the believer will not come into the final judgment. As shown above, the final judgment is not for the purpose of determining whether one will be saved or lost. As to Paul's consistency, we must remember that Paul uses the term works in two wholly different connections and with a somewhat different meaning. When he speaks of "works of law" as a basis of justification, he is speaking of legalistic works, works of merit, works that are intended to merit or earn one's salvation from God. In the other case he is speaking of the deeds of one's life as indicating his character, deeds for which he is responsible and accountable to God. Paul nowhere regards salvation by grace as delivering man from responsibility and accountability to God. This is why he repudiates the idea that justification by faith abrogates or nullifies the law. He says rather that it establishes law.[3] Salvation by grace does away with the law as a method of salvation, but it does not do away with man's responsibility to moral law and his accountability to God. The opposite view is the antinomian view of salvation by grace and would undermine the moral order. It has been urged from New Testament days as an objection to salvation by grace,[4] but it is based on a misunderstanding of what salvation by grace means. Man is not saved by being delivered from obligation to keep the righteous requirements of the moral

[1]Rom. 2: 5, 6.
[2]John 3: 18; 5: 24.
[3]Rom. 3: 31.
[4]See Rom. 6: 1ff.

law; he is saved by being freely forgiven on the basis of Christ's atoning blood and so reënforced by the power of God's renewing grace that he can meet the requirements of the law.[1]

The gift of God's grace to sinful man does not deliver man from responsibility to God; it increases his responsibility. Since God has dealt with man in grace, certainly God's gracious dealings with man will be taken into account in the judgment. This may give a suggestion of what Paul means when he says that God will judge the secrets of men according to his gospel.[2] The judgment will be the vindication of God's past dealings with the race and with the individual members of the race. And since all God's dealings with man have been in and through Christ, Christ will be the judge of mankind. In Christ the race was created, preserved and redeemed; in Christ the race will be judged.[3]

VII. **Heaven.** By heaven we mean the final state of the righteous. This state of final blessedness does not come until after the judgment. This is shown by Matt. 25: 34ff and by Rev. 20: 11-15 followed by chapter 21. It is also shown by such Scriptures as 1 Cor. 15 in which the possession of the resurrection body is placed at the second coming of Christ.

1. The intermediate state. But what about the intermediate state, as it is called; that is, the Christian's condition between death and the resurrection? It is made clear that this state is not one of unconsciousness, or "soul sleeping," so-called. It is a state of consciousness both for the wicked and the righteous. The parable of Dives and Lazarus shows this. Jesus speaks of death as a sleep, but this is not meant to teach that it is a state of unconsciousness, but a state of rest and peace as compared with the turmoil and strife of this life. Laz-

[1]Rom. 8: 1-4.
[2]Rom. 2: 16.
[3]Matt. 25: 31ff; Acts 17: 31; Rom. 2: 16.

arus was seen in a position of rest in Abraham's bosom.[1] This intermediate state is a state of conscious fellowship with the Lord. Paul in speaking about death, as compared with continuing in this life, says that it is "very far better." Why does he think so? Because it means to "depart and be with the Lord."[2] While the intermediate state, then, is not the final state of the Christian, it is made clear that it is a condition of conscious and immediate fellowship with Christ and is, therefore, more glorious and blessed than the present life.

2. The eternal state of the righteous. More properly speaking heaven denotes the eternal state of the righteous, or their state after the resurrection and the judgment. Yet it has to be recognized that there is no very clear line of demarcation made in the Bible between the state upon which the righteous enter immediately after death and their condition after the judgment. Perhaps systems of theology have made more of a distinction than the teachings of the New Testament would justify. The fact, however, that the resurrection and final judgment are placed at the second coming does justify the position that the Christian does not come to his final state this side of the eternal order ushered in at the general judgment. The Christian does not come to the full and final enjoyment of the blessings of redemption until the recreation of a new humanity in Jesus Christ is completed. Our salvation is a part of a plan that a redeeming God has in mind for a new race now being created in the image of Jesus Christ. The individual Christian comes to his final destiny as a member of this new redeemed race of which Christ is the head. Apart from those who come after and those who have preceded us we shall not be made perfect. We have a foretaste of the blessedness of redemption in this life; we enter upon a fuller possession of that blessedness at

[1]Luke 16: 19ff. [2]Phil. 1: 23.

death; we come into full possession of it after judgment. What is said here, however, about the eternal blessedness of the redeemed will apply very largely to their condition between death and the resurrection.

(1) Where is heaven? Heaven is not primarily a place but a state of character. It is freedom from sin and fulness of fellowship with God. A man with sin in his heart could not be happy anywhere in God's universe. He would convert any paradise into a hell. Character is more than environment. A perfect environment will not make perfect character. Some modern soap box orators seem to think a full dinner pail is all that is needed to turn sinners into saints and the world into a paradise. But experience rather indicates that, without the regenerating grace of God, the easier conditions are for the sinner the more perverse he will likely become.

On the other hand, salvation would not be complete without a change of environment as well as a change in character. We have seen that there are indications in the New Testament that there will be a renovation of the physical universe along with the deliverance of the children of God from the bondage of sin and corruption.[1] There will be new heavens and a new earth for a new humanity to inhabit. This will be true whether Peter's statement refers to the renovation of the physical universe or is a figure for the regeneration of the moral universe. The fact that we are to inhabit bodies will probably call for a "local habitation and a name." Heaven will doubtless be a location as well as a state of character. Will it be on this earth? Nobody knows, and there is no use to speculate about the matter. Our glorified bodies may have the power to move through space at the behest of our glorified wills. We do feel safe in holding that, while the primary thing about heaven is a state of character, it will also include a perfect environment.

[1]Rom. 8: 19ff; 2 Peter 3: 13.

(2) Our eternal state will be complete deliverance from sin. Or to state the matter affirmatively, it will be holiness of character. To be like Christ will be heaven. We know that when he shall appear we shall be like him.[1] To make us like Christ in character is the thing that God has had in mind for us from eternity. He predestinated us to be conformed to the image of his Son.[2] Nothing grieves the heart of the Christian so in this life as his own sins and moral lapses. He longs with unutterable longing for complete deliverance. This comes to him in the next life. To be free from sin will be one of the chief elements in the Christian's blessedness in the coming age. Not only will sin be taken out of us, but also out of the whole social order of which we shall be a part. The dogs, the sorcerers, the fornicators, the murderers, the idolaters, and every one that loveth and maketh a lie—these shall all be left outside the Holy City.[3]

(3) Our eternal state will be a life of unhindered fellowship with God in Christ. The Christian's fellowship with God is his chief joy in this life. It is this that brings joy and hope and conquering power. It is for a fuller fellowship with the Lord that the Christian longs in the next life. Paul says that it would be very far better to depart in death and be with the Lord.[4] This is the explanation of the eager looking toward the second coming that we find in the New Testament. While Jesus was on earth, his disciples had fellowship with him in the flesh. During the present age we have fellowship with him in the Spirit. When he returns to receive his people we shall have with him a fellowship that combines the values of the inner and the outer, the spiritual and the physical. In this life our fellowship with God is hindered by our sins and spiritual blindness. When we see the Lord face to face and are completely

[1] 1 John 3: 2.
[2] Rom. 8: 29.
[3] Rev. 22: 15.
[4] Phil. 1: 23.

transformed into his image, then our fellowship with him will be full and complete. This carries with it the idea that heaven is the complete realization of the life of fellowship that man has with God here and now.

Fellowship with God carries with it fellowship with his people. Those we have known on earth we will probably know there, as well as the host of the redeemed. Earthly relations, however, will be swallowed up in a higher relationship. That is true to some extent here. It will be more completely true there. The fundamental relation there will be our relation to God. If family relationships are remembered, they will be subordinated to the higher. There will be no marrying and giving in marriage.[1] There will be social relations in heaven, but they will be subordinate to the religious. God will be first, our fellows second.

(4) The eternal order is one of freedom from natural evil, such as sorrow, sickness and death. There are abundant indications in the New Testament that all forms of natural evil will be transcended in the glorified life of the Christian during the coming age. God will wipe away all tears from the eyes of his people,[2] and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.[3] The complete conquering of sin carries with it complete transcendence of all other forms of evil. When man is entirely right with God and in complete harmony with his will, then all is bound to come right for man. "There shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein."[4] And the reason there shall be no curse is because the throne of God and of the Lamb is there. God's authority and rule will have abolished all evil and everything that is accursed. This is relatively true for this life, but comes to full realization in the life to come.

This complete transcendence of evil is beautifully pictured in Rev. 21 and 22 under the figure of the new

[1]Mark 12: 25.
[2]Isa. 25: 8; Rev. 7: 17; 21: 4.
[3]Isa. 51: 11.
[4]Rev. 22: 3.

Jerusalem come down out of heaven to men. In the book of Revelation, we do not get out of the atmosphere of turmoil and strife until we get past the judgment in chapter 20 and come to the new Jerusalem in chapter 21. But when we get to chapter 21, we seem to have come into an altogether new atmosphere, one of eternal calm and joy. The strife and disappointments of this earth-life are past. We come into a perfected social life in which love to God and one's fellows reigns. God is supreme. All his enemies and ours are vanquished. Life abundant is the portion of God's people and eternal peace is theirs.

(5) There will be ceaseless service to God. His servants shall serve him in the eternal order.[1] Heaven is no place for inactivity: it is no lazy man's paradise. It is a place of abundant life and life means activity. In the very nature of the case created beings would serve the God who created them. What forms our service will take we are not told. It is enough that we are assured that we shall serve God. Doubtless praise and adoration will forever be given to the God who has redeemed us.[2] But doubtless also we will do something more than sing and praise. Even singing might grow monotonous if it were not mixed with other forms of activity.

(6) Heaven will also doubtless be a place or state of endless development. It will be at once asked: "Is not heaven a state of perfection and does not perfection exclude the idea of growth?" Heaven is a state of perfection. It is freedom from sin and its total curse. But a perfect state for man is not a state in which there is no growth. This is shown in the case of Jesus. He was sinless, but he grew. A state of perfection for a created being is rather a state in which everything that hinders growth is removed. The great hindrance to growth in this life is sin. When sin is taken out of us and we are

[1]Rev. 22: 3. [2]Rev. 12: 10.

placed in an environment in which sin as an obstruction to growth is removed, we will then be in a condition to begin to grow as we should.

In 1 Corinthians 13: 9-12 Paul indicates that there will be a great change in the method and character of our knowledge. He is here perhaps referring to the eternal order. Doubtless our knowledge then will be more direct and intuitive than now. We shall then see face to face and know fully as we are known. But we can not interpret this to mean omniscience. Only God is omniscient. For a being who is not omniscient there is always room for growth. And when we come into face-to-face communion with God, there will doubtless be such a renovation and readjustment of our rational powers as to make it possible for us to grow in knowledge as we do not now dream possible.

Again, Paul indicates that faith, hope and love are the abiding virtues of the Christian life.[1] Knowledge passes away in that it is swallowed up in fuller knowledge, as the knowledge of the child is swallowed up in that of the man.[2] Faith, hope and love do not pass away. They abide forever. But hope looks to the future. It looks for something not yet realized. This indicates that even in heaven there will always be before us possibilities toward which we are moving that we have not yet attained. And Paul's statement indicates that faith and hope are just as eternal as love. This would seem almost to necessitate the idea that the future life for the Christian will be a life of eternal growth. Boundless possibilities of development in knowledge, power and holiness are our inheritance in Christ Jesus, and endless ages are ours in which to attain our possibilities.

VIII. **Hell.**

1. The certainty of future punishment. As pointed out in connection with the judgment, the idea of judg-

[1] 1 Cor. 13: 13. [2] 1 Cor. 13: 8-11.

ment runs through the whole Bible. The ideas of divine judgment and of punishment for sin are inseparable. What was said, therefore, about the certainty of judgment will apply to punishment for sin.

Men are punished in this life for their sins. That is made clear in the examples and teachings of the Bible. It is also verified in experience. But men do not get the full punishment for their sins in this life. The full punishment for sin, therefore, must come in the next life. We maintain that men will be punished in the future life for the following reasons:

(1) It is distinctly taught in the Bible. Punishment for sin is emphasized in the Old Testament, but it is mainly punishment in this life. In the New Testament punishment for sin in the future life is clearly taught. Nobody teaches this more clearly and emphatically than does Jesus. He solemnly and repeatedly warns men against the dangers of a hell of fire in which God will destroy both soul and body.[1] The teaching of Jesus is set forth with special clearness in connection with what he says on the judgment.[2] The book of Revelation speaks of the lake of fire into which the wicked will be cast after the judgment and identifies it with the second death.[3]

(2) The very existence of a moral order requires that sinners shall be punished. The reason there is a hell is because there is sin in the world. In a moral world there must be a difference between the righteous and the wicked. If the righteous and the wicked were treated alike there would be no moral order; it would be non-moral. The very existence of sin, then, demands the punishment of sin. The man who lives in sin can never be made happy. Sin and punishment cannot be separated. Christ saves men first from sin, then from

[1]Matt. 5: 22, 29; 10: 28; 18: 9; Mark 9: 43, 45; Luke 12: 5 *et al.*
[2]Matt. 25: 41-46.
[3]Rev. 20: 10, 14, 15; 21: 8.

punishment. He cannot save from punishment except as he saves from sin. The same word in the Old Testament may be translated iniquity or punishment.[1] This shows that in Hebrew thought punishment could not be separated from sin. Sin carries its own punishment. Many men think that if they can just stay out of the fire after they die they will be all right. What they need to see is that they must get the fire of sin out of their souls. Man cannot be made happy while he remains in sin. The moral order of the world makes it impossible. Looked at from this viewpoint, man makes his own hell. He reaps what he sows. His violence comes down upon his own pate. His feet are ensnared in the gin that he sets for others. He digs a ditch and falls into it himself.[2]

(3) The sinner's moral nature is a guarantee that sin will be punished. Because man is what he is, he will suffer for sin. He cannot escape from punishment for sin, because he cannot escape from himself. The lashings of conscience and memory, the vain regrets and remorse that follow in the wake of a misspent life will make a hot enough hell for any man. "Myself am hell." So many a man finds out. He thinks, at first, that if he can escape the law and public reproach, he will be safe. But he soon comes to find out that he may escape from the law, but cannot escape from himself, and he cannot have peace anywhere until he comes to be at peace in his own mind and heart.

(4) Sin must be punished because it is opposed to the holy nature of God. Sin violates the moral order of the world; but that order is a revelation of the holy nature of God. This is God's world. The very nature of sin is such that it would dethrone God. God must punish sin or abdicate his throne. As stated above, man brings down destruction upon himself. But it does not follow from this that his punishment is not from God. God in-

[1]See Gen. 4: 13.
[2]See Ps. 7: 15, 16; 9: 15, 16; 57: 6, etc.

stituted and sustains the moral order under which the sinner suffers. That moral order is so made that man cannot sin without suffering, and the reason it is that way is because God wills that it should be. It may be truly said, then, either that the sinner destroys himself, or that God destroys him.

2. The nature and extent of future punishment.

(1) Such expressions as those spoken of—"the hell of fire," "the lake of fire" and "the second death"—indicate the awfulness of the fate of the impenitent. There are those who insist that the fire spoken of must be literal fire. Some insist on this with great strenuousness and seem to think that to interpret the language as figurative means to do away with the reality of future punishment. But one could maintain this position only on the assumption that a figure of speech does not represent a reality. Jesus speaks of the place of punishment as a place of outer darkness.[1] It could not be a place of literal fire and of literal darkness both. But there is no more reason for taking one expression as literal than there is for taking the other as literal. Besides, literal fire would destroy a body cast into it. Some would say that it is a literal fire, but not the kind of fire that we are accustomed to. But to say that it is not the kind of fire we are used to is equivalent to saying that it is not literal fire. Moreover, to inflict purely physical pain on the sinner would not be to adapt his punishment to the nature of his sin. The sinner's punishment in this life is adapted to the nature of his sin, and there is no good reason why the same should not be true in the next world. Since we reap the final reward of our deeds in the next life, it would seem that the conformity of punishment to sin in its nature would probably be closer even than in this. Physical suffering would not be an adequate punishment for spiritual sins. It is entirely possible, then, that the nature of the punishment in the next life will depend

[1]Matt. 8: 12; 22: 13; 25: 30.

on the nature of the sin for which it is a punishment and that there will be as much variety in the kinds of punishment inflicted as there is variety in the kinds of sinners punished.

(2) It is made clear in the New Testament that punishment will be in proportion to the greatness of one's guilt. Jesus recognizes this when he says that it will be more tolerable in the day of judgment for Tyre and Sidon than it will be for the cities that have rejected him and his message.[1] Paul also manifests a belief in this principle. He says: "As many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law; and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the law."[2] He says also that those who do not have the law are a law unto themselves in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their consciences bearing witness therewith.[3] This principle clearly commends itself to man's sense of justice. There is nothing in either reason or Scripture to justify the idea that all the impenitent will be punished to the same extent in the next life.

3. The endlessness of future punishment. It seems to be made clear in the Bible that the future punishment of the wicked is endless. In the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, in answer to the Rich Man's request that Lazarus dip his finger in water and cool the Rich Man's tongue, Jesus represents Abraham as saying: "And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they that would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us."[4] Here Jesus seems to be expressly teaching that, if a man dies unrepentant, there is no hope of mercy in the next life. His condition is unchangeable. There is no crossing from one place to the other. Another passage that seems to be decisive on this point is on the judgment in Matt. 25. Jesus says: "These go away

[1]Matt. 11: 22.
[2]Rom. 2: 12.
[3]Rom. 2: 14, 15.
[4]Luke 16: 26.
[5]Matt. 25: 46.

into eternal punishment; but the righteous into eternal life."[5] Here the Lord uses the same word to describe the endurance of the punishment of the wicked that he uses to describe the endurance of the blessedness of the righteous. If the word as applied to the blessedness of the righteous means never ending, why should it not mean the same thing as applied in the same context to the punishment of the wicked?

In general, there are two views that deny the endlessness of future punishment. One is the view of restorationism or universalism. This holds in different forms to the idea that man will suffer in the future life for his sins, but that this suffering will be remedial in its nature, and that through his sufferings he will be purified from sin and finally delivered from it. There is no evidence, however, in the Scriptures that suffering in the future life will be remedial in its nature, and positive teaching to the contrary. Suffering is remedial in this life, but not wholly so. There is no teaching in the New Testament that the next life will be redemptive in its purpose. All that we have on the subject is in the contrary direction.

Then it is held by some that sin and its punishment are destructive in the sense that the soul and its powers are blotted out of existence. It is pointed out that sin here tends to dissipate and destroy. This destructive tendency of sin is the punishment for sin, and the second death is the complete annihilation of man's existence. But this would lead to the conclusion that the greater sinner one became the sooner would his conscious existence come to an end and, therefore, the less his punishment. Besides, sin does not always tend to destroy one's conscious powers in this life. And when it does so, it may be due to the fact that man's soul inhabits an organism of "flesh and blood." This may not be true of the soul during the intermediate state nor after the resurrection of the body.

So the only hopes of deliverance from sin and its awful consequences held out in the gospel of Christ are for this life, and the evidence indicates that no man will be saved after he departs this world. This does not mean, as sometimes held, that evangelical theology teaches that the great mass of mankind is damned to an eternal hell, since only a small portion of the race has professedly accepted Christ. It means that it is made clear in the New Testament that the man who consciously and definitely accepts Christ as Savior and Lord is assured of eternal blessedness with him in the next world; and that the man who consciously and wilfully rejects God's mercy manifested in Christ and dies in impenitence is solemnly warned that he will be eternally punished for his sins. The great mass of mankind lying in between these two classes we can safely leave in the hands of God, being assured that he will do what is right with reference to every son of man and that he knows to which of these two classes each man belongs.

How much moral light and spiritual knowledge one must have before he can so commit sin as to seal his destiny for evil, we perhaps cannot determine. Nor is it our business to do so. To decide this question is God's prerogative. It is ours to give every man we possibly can the full light of the gospel, so that he may have conscious salvation through faith in Christ or be left without excuse because of the rejected grace of God.

GENERAL INDEX

A

Absoluteness of God, 213.
Adoption, defined, 455.
Adoration and prayer, 480.
Agnosticism: stated, 98; and God, 99; inconsistency of, 99; an appraisal of, 99; finite and infinite, 100; and religion. 101; and pantheism, 102.
Annihilation, 561.
Anthropological proof of existence of God, 82.
Apollinarians, 155.
Apologetics, defined, 15, 16.
Apostles and Second Coming, 532.
Arians, 155, 261.
Assurance: faith its own, 62; and Holy Spirit, 245.
Athanasius, 155, 262.
Atonement: doctrine of, 272ff; by death of Christ, 380; self-disclosure of God, 384; extent of, 338; fallacies about, 302; and resurrection, 385; exposition of Biblical doctrine of, 383; elements in, 386; motive of, 386; and faith, 393; false theories, 394; example theory, 395; moral example theory, 397; governmental theory, 404.
Attributes of God: defined, 184; difficulties concerning, 184; classification, 185; antagonistic, to 185; fundamental, 201; eternal, 407.
Augustine, 335; theory of sin, 332.
Authority and freedom, 121.

B

Baptism of Holy Spirit, 251.
Bible: God and the, 106; record of special revelation, 106; witness in, 107; and inspiration, 108, 120; and criticism, 109; and practical need, 109; record of God's work, 108; authority of, 115, 120; purpose of, 124; doctrine in, 125; how to study, 126.
Biblical exegesis, 18.
Biblical theology, 18.
Bunyan, John, 332.
Burton, Dr., 389, 396, 402.

C

Causality, as principle in formal proof of existence of God, 81.
Chalcedon, 155.
Christian work and mission, 475; life and growth, 419, 499.
Christianity: as a religion, 12; essence of, 412; Christ in, 13; historical, 13, 56; redemptive, 13, 280; a life, 14; ethical, 17; history of, 18; reaction against, 21; definition, 42, 14; universal, 69; final, 70; and Judaism, 72; and miracles, 285.
Church, and Holy Spirit, 257.
Commercial theory of atonement, 405.
Comparative religions, 19.
Conversion: and repentance, 419; and Holy Spirit, 243, 324.
Cosmological argument for existence of God, 81.
Creation: doctrine of, 272; and redemption, 274; eternal, 277; and evolution, 298ff.

D

Davidson, "Old Testament Theology," 207.
Death: of Christ as penalty of sin, 245, 288; spiritual, 348;

vicarious, 389; substitutionary, 391; union with Christ as conquest of, 525; and immortality, 528.
Deism, 88.
Denney, James, 168, 401.
Depravity, 330; total, 333ff.
Deity of Christ, 144.
Dispensations, 265.
Docetae, 131, 154.
Doctrines: Christian, materials, 12; purpose, 14; history of, 18; need for, 20; re-action against, 21; a science, 22; progressive, 23; and Bible, 125; use of Bible in, 126.

E

Ebionites, 154.
Eddy, Mrs. Mary Baker, 59, 401, 481.
Edwards, Jonathan, 225.
Election: defined, 356; proof for, 253; new summary of, 257; in Israel, 258; in Testament, 260; and man's freedom, 267; not of partiality, 361; and universalism, 361; objections to, 362.
Eschatology: doctrine of, 511ff; difficulties of, 512.
Eternal: meaning of word, 490; of righteous, 55.
Eternity, defined, 219.
Ethics: Christian, 16; relation to doctrine, 17.
Evolution: biological, 296; not proven, 298; and doctrine of creation, 206.
Experience, Christian: elements of knowledge in, 49-54; transforming power of, 50; religious conditions of, 53.

F

Fairbairn, A. M., 162, 340.
Faith: definition, 46, 55, 149, 420; fellowship through, 45; objectively grounded, 55; as knowledge, 55, 161; and experience, 53; venture of, 57, 62; basis in life, 59, 60; as subjective, 56; as spiritual vision, 60; intelligent, 60; means of knowledge, 61; and assurance, 62; related to Bible, 124; as surrender, 150; as trust, 149; results of, 150; moral results, 151; and atonement, 393; and Holy Spirit, 247; and providence, 420; and righteous, 430; saving, 421; submissive, 422.
Federal Theory, 335.
Foreknowledge and prayer, 484.
Foreordination and human freedom, 222.
Forgiveness: through Christ, 435; meaning of, 438; objections to, 443.
Forsythe, Dr., 438, 483.
Freedom and election, 367; personal, 94; and authority, 121.

G

Gess and Beecher theory, 164.
God: direct knowledge of, 27; source of knowledge, 30; objectively revealed in Christ, 36; consciousness through Christ, 44; redemptive knowledge of, 46; a universal idea, 71; proofs of existence, 80; Christian theistic view, 182; as self-realized in man, 80; idea in Judaism, 183; attributes of, 184; personality of, 186; spirituality of, 186, 188; moral consciousness of, 187; infinity of, 190; and the Trinity, 191, 233; moral nature of, 193; and righteousness, 194; love of, 200; holiness, 206; justice, 209; ethical transcendence, 208; mercy, 209;

absoluteness, 213ff; omnipresence, 218; immensity, 220; omniscience, 220; omnipotence, 224; and Holy Spirit, 233, 263; relation of Christ to, 263; as creator, 272; purpose in creation, 274; immanence of, 278; preserves world, 278; transcends world, 278; as governing, 280; and miracles, 280; the desire for, 354; and man's freedom, 370; wrath of, 375; anthropomorphic conception of, 376.
Gospels, as truth, 21.
Governmental theory of atonement, 404.
Grace: and Holy Spirit, 241; supernatural character of, 288; and sin, 322; "falling from," 497.
Guilt: and sin, 327; degrees of, 330.

H

Hardshellism, 372.
Heaven: doctrine of, 550ff; where, 552; development in, 555.
Hell: doctrine of, 556ff; and moral freedom, 557; punishment in, 558.
Heredity, 337.
History, God in, 354.
Holiness: a divine attribute, 208; fundamental, 210.
Holy Spirit: doctrine of, 231ff; in regeneration, 231, 245; complete process of divine immanence, 231, 242; nature and personality of, 233; relation to Jesus Christ, 237, 264; work in salvation, 243; in justification, 248; in resurrection, 248; in sanctification, 248; baptism of, 252; enduement of, 253; continues Christ's redemptive work, 254; filled with, 254; gift of, 254; in the church, 257; sovereignty of, 258; and Trinity, 263ff; in conviction, 324; sin against, 325; in preservation, 492.
Humanitarian theory, 158.

I

Immanence: divine, 242; and transcendance, 278.
Immensity, defined, 220.
Immutability: revelation through, 75; and eschatology, 523.
Impersonal force in creation, 275.
Incarnation: necessity for, 146; mystery of, 159; misconceptions concerning, as self-emptying, 162; motive of, 163.
Infants, salvation of, 340.
Intelligence in personality, 288.
Intercession: of Christ, 407; and perseverance, 548.
Intermediate state, 550.
Israel: a theocratic kingdom, 516.

J

James, William, 31, 64, 226, 466.
Jesus Christ: mediates fellowship with God, 31, 40; in consciousness of God, 36; objective revelation in, 36; life of, continuous with God, 36; teachings concerning God, 37; life and character, 38; sinlessness of, 38, 133; miracles of, 39, 287; God-sent, 39; as Redeemer, 40, 140; doctrine of person of, 131; humanity of, 131; virgin birth, 133; resurrection of, 135; ascension, 138; pre-existence of, 140; as Lord, 142; final judge, 143; deity of, 144, 261; pretemporal, 145; as light, 153;

incarnation of, 154, 159; two natures of, 154; humanitarian theory, 157; re-ascent of, 166; stages in re-ascent, 167; baptism and temptation, 169; exaltation, 174; and the Trinity 263; and Holy Spirit, 263, 236.
Judaism, 72, 102, 516.
Judge, Jesus as, 143.
Judgment: relation to return of Christ, 530; doctrine of, 544; fact of, 545; purpose of, 546; and destiny, 547; grounds of, 548.
Justification: defined, 447; in Christ, 447; not merely declarative, 448; objections to doctrine, 449; Roman Catholic doctrine of, 450; and regeneration, 451; value of doctrine, 452; and perseverance, 482.

K

Kant, Immanuel, 82, 98.
Kenotic theories, 163.
Kingdom of God: Christ's activity in, 113, 515; and eschatology, 515; as related to sovereignty of God, 516; defined, 517; progressive, 519; eternal, 522.
Knowledge: coming through Christian experience, 22, 28, 48; of God, 28, 220; as *a priori* method, 28, 49; objective and subjective, 30; limitations of, 31; faith a form of, 57; as self-evidencing, 61; agnosticism, 99; and sin, 320.

L

Learning: by living, 64.
Love: of God, 200; defined, 200; among the attributes, 200; motive of atonement, 200; sacrificial, 202.
Luther, Martin, 122, 332.

M

Mabie, H. C., 405, 406, 407.
MacIntyre, R. G., 541.
Mackintosh, H. R., 290.
Man: as related to theology, 31; as religious, 31, 79, 94; bears divine image, 32, 304; and nature, 78, 94; and freedom, 94; and pantheism, 97; as related to God's righteousness, 196; origin of, 294; related to objective reality, 294; climax of nature, 295; and evolution, 295; as both physical and spiritual, 303; dichotomous theory, 302; trichotomous theory, 302; original condition, 305.
Materialism: stated, 92; present standing of, 93; objections to, 93; and pantheism, 97.
Matter and spirit, 276.
Miracles: of Jesus, 39, 111, 287; and natural law, 280, 283; nature and possibility of, 283; as a creative act, 286; and Christianity, 287.
Modalism, 265.
Moral influence theory of the atonement, 397.
Moral law, 377.
Mullins, E. Y., 12, 68, 163, 208, 211, 212, 289, 290, 303, 401, 419.

N

Nature: and Holy Spirit, 242; order of, as related to prayer, 485; of God, 188ff.
Natural law: and miracles, 280; defined, 280.
Natural evil: and penalty of, 343ff.
Nestorians, 155.

O

Old Testament as revelation, 72.
Omnipotence: defined, 224; as

limited by freedom of man, 225.
Omnipresence: defined, 218.
Omniscience: defined, 220.
Ontological argument for existence of God, 85.

P

Pantheism: stated, 94; and God, 95, 96, 98, 189; and nature, 95; and immortality, 95; and incarnation, 95; as related to self-consciousness, 96; undermines morals, 97; compared with materialism, 97; and agnosticism, 102.
Parker, Theodore, 317ff.
Penalty: and guilt, 329; of sin, 342.
Pentecost, 240.
Perfectionism, 505.
Petition and prayer, 481.
Perseverance: defined, 489; proof of, 491; and election, 491; and atonement, 491; and justification, 492; and union with Christ, 493; and Christ's intercession, 493; and Holy Spirit, 494; objections to, 495.
Personality: reveals God, 65; in universe, 93; as interpreting the universe, 153; elements of, 183; of God, 186; and prayer, 481.
Philosophy: of religion, 16; related to doctrines, 16.
Pharisee, 329.
Postmillennialism, 514ff.
Prayer: elements in, 480; and petition, 481; purpose and scope, 481; and personality, 481; God's purpose in, 483; objections and difficulties, 483.
Predestination (see election).
Pre-existence: of Christ, 140.
Preservation (see perseverance).
Proofs: for existence of God, 82.
Prophets: mediums of revelation, 74.
Prophecy: Christ fulfills, 114.
Propitiation, 390.
Providence, 427ff; and redemption, 477; and faith, 479.
Psychology: of religion, 19.
Punishment: eternal, 559.

R

Race unity, 336.
Reason: and faith, 55, 61, 65; and God, 184.
Re-ascent of Christ: stated, 166; objections to, 172; Dorner's theory, 173.
Reconciliation: God's purpose in, 354; and justification, 451; through Christ, 452.
Redemption: in Christ, 40, 140; and God, 47; and Christianity, 282, 43; and providence, 477.
Regeneration: work of Holy Spirit, 245, 463, 468; defined, 456; need of, 457; nature of change, 459; and ethical ideal, 461; and faith, 465; in conscious mind, 466; by the Holy Spirit, 468.
Religion: experimental method in, 64; relation of agnosticism.
Repentance: defined, 415ff; not reformation, 418.
Restorationism, 561.
Resurrection: and Holy Spirit, 248; and immortality, 537; of just and unjust, 538; general, 539; time of, 540; nature of body, 542; as to body of wicked, 544.
Resurrection of Christ: fulfills redemptive activity, 41; doctrine of, 135ff; in Paul's teaching, 137; and Second Coming, 530.

Revelation: in Christ, 36, 66, 69, 72; personal, 65; in human terms, 66; finality of, 69, 92; purpose of, 69; subordinate, 71; 75; to Israel, 72, 75; methods and means, 73; through man, 76; phases of, 76; relation of Bible to, 106; 116; progressive, 117.
Rewards (see eschatology).
Righteousness: as attribute of God, 195; and love, 212; growth in, 248.
Ritschl, A., 158.
Royce, Josiah, 226.

S

Sabellianism, 265.
Sacrifice: of Christ, 40, 112.
Salvation: as fellowship, 13; by faith, 13, 426; and Holy Spirit, 243; a miracle, 292; through God only, 357; of infants, 340; conditions of, 414; in Christ 467; of all Christians, 468; conscious of, 469; why lack of assurance of, 470.
Sanday, William, 166.
Satan, 311ff.
Schliermacher, 158.
Science and Scripture, 115.
Science, physical: contrasted with theological, 22; laws of, 280.
Second Coming: purpose of, 114; doctrine of, 525ff; nature of, 527; importance of, 529; time of, 531.
Self-development, 186.
Self-emptying: divine, 163.
Sin: doctrine of, 311ff; origin, 311; agency of Satan, 311; definition of, 315; and the body, 316; as weakness, 317; as rebellion, 318; as will, 318; and law, 321; as unbelief, 325; as selfishness, 326; and moral law, 326; and guilt, 327; as depravity, 330; transmitted, 331; universal, 332; original, 334; Augustinian theory, 335; federal theory, 335; and penalty, 342; and race unity, 336; as moral depravity, 387; and death, 348; forgiveness of, 435.
Sinlessness of Jesus, 133.
Slavery and the Christian ideal, 52.
Smythe, Newman, 211.
Society, transformation of, 52.
Sovereignty: divine, and moral freedom, 227.
Spirit: God as, 192; and matter, 276.
Stevens, Prof., 322.
Strong, A. H., 165, 185, 202, 210, 246, 264, 297, 302, 370, 407, 419, 434, 461, 466.
Supernatural elements in religion, 112.

T

Teleological argument for existence of God, 81.
Temptation: of Jesus, 314; of Eve, 314.
Theism: and moral order, 78; versus materialism, 85; anti-Christian, 102; and miracles, 284.
Theology: defined, 12; purpose, 14; Biblical, 18; and life, 20; limitations of, 21; a science, 22; progressive, 23; test of, 316.
Transcendence and immanence, 278.
Trinity: doctrine of, 19, 263ff; and Holy Spirit, 263, 266; and Christ, 263ff; and Greek philosophy, 263; work of three persons, 264.

Truth and authority, 123.
Two-nature controversy, 154.

U

Unbelief as sin, 325.
Unitarianism, 102, 317.
Universe, creation of, 272.
Utilitarianism, 561.
Union with Christ, 431.

V

Virgin birth of Christ, 133; proof of, 134.
Virgin Mary, 135.

W

War and Christianity, 52.
Wendland, 282.
Will: of man, 94; of God, 224; as an originating cause, 224.
World: man's interpretation of, 77; God's place in, 218.

INDEX TO SCRIPTURE TEXTS

Genesis

1:1ff 272
1:2 242
1:26ff 295
1:26, 27 ....294, 303
2:7 .....242, 301
..... 299
2:17 .....348, 349
..... 528
3:6 314
3:8 328
3:15 354
3:17-19 ....345, 346
3:17-19 530
4:13 558
6:9 506
9:9-17 355
12:1ff 355
12:2, 3 517
17:1 506
18:22ff 481
18:25 195

Exodus

3:14 146
20:1-6 215
20:5 203
20:12 347
31:3 243
32:31ff 481

Leviticus

7:13 520
11:44 209
23:17 520

Deuteronomy

9:25ff 481
18:13 506

Judges

3:10 253
11:29-33 243
14:6 243
14:6, 19 253
15:14 253

I Samuel

8: 517
10:10 253
11:6 253
16:13, 14 253

Job

1:1 506
1:12 502

Psalms

1:6 361
6:5 523
7:11, 12 376
7:15, 16 558
9:15, 16 558
11:7 199
14:1ff 332
16:8-11 523
19:1 75
24:1 216
27:1 .....431, 435
30:9 523
32: 436
46:8, 9 520
47:2 516
49:14,15 435
51: 436
51:4 .....327, 439
51:5 331
51:7 438
51:14 199
51:17 .....233, 417
57:6 558
73:24ff 523
78: 319
88:10-12 523
103:3 .....435, 436
103:19 516
103:22 516
104:29, 30 233
104:30 242

110:1 174
115:17 523
130:4 446
137:8, 9 118
139:7ff 243

Proverbs

3:1, 2 347
10:27 347

Ecclesiastes

3:19 233
9:10 523
12:7 233

Isaiah

1: 439
2:1ff 513
2:2-4 520
6: 207, 329
11:6-9 520
13: 216
15: 216
17: 216
19: 216
25:8 554
26:19 523
38:17 438
38:18-20 523
40:12ff 216
40:18-29 216
41:10 199
42:1ff 355
42:6 199
45:13 199
45:22 422
45:13 199
51:6 199
51:11 554
53: 385
55:3 422
55:8, 9 207
59:2 439
61:10 199

Jeremiah

8:11, 12 437
17:9 331
23:5ff 435
31:31-34 ....436, 437
31:34 437

Ezekiel

18:23, 32 366
33:11 366
37: 539
37:12ff 523
40:48 513

Daniel

2:44 517
12:1-3 523
12:2 .....523, 537

Joel

2:28, 29 253

Micah

4:1-4 520
7:19 438

Zechariah

12:10 233
14:8ff 513

Matthew

1:3 423
1:4 423
1:18 423
1:20 237
1:21 .....40, 141
2:3 377
2:11 517
3:2 355
3:11, 12 252
3:18 423
3:36 423
5:6 504
5:8 506
5:17ff 115, 117
..... 196
5:20 458
5:21, 26 .....38, 458
5:22 .....389, 557
5:23, 24 455
5:29 557
5:43ff 37, 196
5:45 201
5:48 ....38, 209, 397
.....458, 522
6:6-8 .....37, 485
6:10 477
6:12 ...133, 332, 406
.....437, 438
6:15 446
6:19ff 203
6:25ff 37, 75
6:26ff 478
6:35 423
7:7-11 .....37, 488
7:23 361
7:24-27 ....143, 423
8:11, 12 ....355, 559
8:12 423
9:5 423
10:24ff 501
10:28 ....38, 302, 376
..... 557
10:29, 30 .....37, 478
10:30 423
10:32, 33 423
10:34ff 423
11:20ff 323, 330
11:22 560
11:25-30 .....422, 426
11:27 ..39, 40, 66, 133
.....143, 433
11:28 421
11:29 143
12:22ff ...38, 165, 325
12:28 238
12:31 235
12:39 203
12:43-45 499
13:20, 21 499
13:24ff 521
13:31-33 ....355, 519
13:43 522
14:6 423
15:1ff 423
16:17 .....66, 142
16:21 381
16:22 171
16:24 ...358, 395, 415
.....419, 457

16:25 .....415, 457
16:27 527
18:1-4 422
18:3 .....143, 420
18:9 557
18:20 .....114, 174
.....178, 263
19:3-12 118
20:17-19 381
20:28 390
21:22 488
22:13 559
23: 377
24:13 498
24:22 360
24:23ff 531
24:27 .....525, 529
24:30 527
24:32-34 .....532, 533
24:37-39 .....527, 531
..... 534
25: 548
25:5 534
25:19 534
25:30 559
25:31ff ..143, 144, 423
....527, 540, 550
25:32 548
25:34 .....522, 550
25:41ff 376, 557
25:46 560
26:13 143
26:28 .....133, 141
..... 382
26:29 522
26:38 388
26:39ff 238
27:46 388
28:1-8 136
28:8 136
28:9 542
28:11-15 138
28:16ff 136
28:18 174
28:19 .....263, 356
..... 475
28:20 .....114, 174
..... 178

Mark

1:15 517
1:16ff 475
1:35 168
2:5 .....40, 133
.....144, 149
2:7 149
2:14 475
3:5 377
4:16, 17 499
5:1ff 234
5:30 165
5:39 524
8:31 381
8:34 142
8:36 302
8:38 527
9:14ff 234
9:31 381
9:42ff 376
9:43, 45 557
10:18 209
10:21 423
10:33 381
10:45 ....40, 141, 380
....382, 390, 402
..... 406
12:18-27 542
12:24ff 523
12:25 554
12:26, 27 524
12:29-31 196
12:30 302
13:13 .....490, 498
13:26 527
13:32 164
14:32ff 171
14:36 41

Luke

1:32, 33 517
1:35 .....135, 237
1:41 253
1:67 253
1:76, 77 437
2:11 141
2:31, 32 355
2:46 168
2:49 .....37, 168
3:21-22 238
4:1 253
4: 1, 2 238
4:14 238
4:16 168
4:17 168
4:18 238
2:52 167
6:26 502
7:48 133
7:40ff 399, 469
9:23 147
9:59-62 ....142, 423
10:16 502
10:25ff 458
11:1 168
11:4 133
11:5ff 489
11:13 .....254, 332
11:24, 26 499
12:5ff 557
12:12 235
12:47, 48 ....320, 330
13:3, 5 343
13:34 319
14:26 143
14:33 .....142, 395
..... 423
15: 38
15:17 434
16:19ff 376, 524
..... 551
16:26 560
17: 20, 21 518
18:1 489
18:7 360
18:22 142
19:10 .....13, 40, 141
.....358, 374

21:27 527
22:22 370
22:31ff 502
22:32 .....409, 493
23:46 37
24:11, 21 136
24:13ff 136
24:39 542
24:44ff 115
24:47 .....356, 437
24:49 .....239, 253
24:50, 51 139

John

1:1 ....140, 191, 192
.....206, 263
1:1-3 132
1:1, 14 67
1:1-18 145
1:3 .....148, 242
.....393, 423
1:4 .....215, 423
1:9 217
1:12 ...421, 463, 465
1:14 .....132, 140
1:17 216
1:18 ....42, 132, 192
.....206, 423
1:29 .....141, 382
.....385, 388
1:33 253
2:20, 27 254
3:3 .....48, 456
.....463, 518
3:5 428
3:6 358
3:14 .....141, 382
.....388, 422
3:16 .....41, 141
.....386, 405
3:17 528
3:18 .....141, 320
.....422, 547
3:19 ....46, 323, 374
3:21 376
3:34 238
3:36 ...141, 143, 324
.....422, 490
4:6ff 132
4:12 141
4:22-24 217
4:23 357
4:24 192
4:34 39
5:17-29 146
5:21ff 461
5:22 .....143, 158
5:23 143
5:24 .....450, 492
.....495, 549
5:25 ...215, 457, 539
5:26 215
5:28, 29 ....215, 538
5:30 39
5:39-46 115
6:15 .....171, 382
6:35 .....423, 432
6:37 .....359, 421
6:37-39 361
6:38 39
6:44 358
6:44 463
6:52-59 421
6:57 382
7:29 40
8:12 423
8:31 499
8:32, 36 334
8:44 377
8:46 133
8:58 .....140, 146
9:1ff 347
9:5 423
10:11-18 ....387, 423
10:14-17 383
10:15 40
10:17, 18 .40, 385, 392
10:27, 28 432
10:30 423
10:43 141
11:11 524
11:25 .....143, 215
11:26 348
11:42 133
12:24 457
12:31 502
12:47 528
13:39 141
14:6-10 .....133, 423
14:8 152
14:9 .....152, 183
14:10 39
14:13 489
14:15, 21 472
14:16 ...236, 239, 263
14:17 234
14:18 .....114, 263
14:19 .....410, 493
14:20 432
14:26 235
14:30 502
15:1ff ..423, 432, 499
15:7 489
15:22 323
15:26 ...235, 239, 464
16:7-8 ..235, 235, 239
16:7-11 236
16:8-11 .244, 324, 463
16:13, 14 239
16:31 141
17: 410
17:2 .....361, 529
17:3 .....141, 469
17:5 .....140, 178
17:11-15 493
18:36 422
19:30 382
20:11, 12 543
20:14ff 136
20:19 136
20:22 239
20:24, 25 136
20:26 136
20:26 544
20:28 146
20:31 .....141, 470

21:18ff 535
21:22 527

Acts

1:1 ....113, 139, 175
1:3 136
1:5 .....239, 252
1:6 518
1:8 ....176, 253, 356
1:9 139
1:11 527
2:4 44
2:17 253
2:21 422
2:23 .....370, 433
2:24 .....172, 385
2:25 523
2:29-34 519
2:32, 33 .....41, 241
2:33 .....113, 139
.....239, 253
2:36 ...139, 174, 176
.....143, 519
2:37 463
2:38 ...254, 428, 437
2:40 502
4:8 253
4:12 .....13, 113
4:12 141
4:19 44
4:31 253
5:3 .....235, 264
5:4 264
5:31 .....133, 433
5:32 464
6:3 253
7:51 235
7:55 253
7:56 139
7:60 .....143, 524
8:8 470
8:29 235
9:13 467
9:17 255
10:34 364
10:38 .....112, 254
10:43 141
10:43 .....422, 437
10:45 .....253, 254
11:16 252
11:24 253
12:10 461
13: 260
13:1ff 356
13:2 235
13:9 253
13:33 523
13:38, 39 ....429, 428
13:39 141
13:48 359
13:52 .....253, 470
14:17 320
16: 470
16:6 235
16:31 141
16:31 422
17:28 .....161, 548
17:30, 31 ....343, 528
..... 550
18:10 372
19:1ff 254
22:16 428
24:15 538
27:14ff 498

Romans

1: 330
1:4 .....139, 143
.....147, 176
1:5 .....150, 424
1:7 467
1:16 ....13, 142, 250
....422, 428, 463
1:17 .....199, 465
1:18-3:20 376
1:18 ...197, 199, 320
.....387, 388
1:20 75
2:5, 6 549
2:12 560
2:14, 15 ....321, 560
2:16 550
2:29 456
3:9ff 332
3:19-26 387
3:20 .....320, 376
3:21-26 383
3:23 196
3:25 390
3:28 .....450, 548
3:31 549
4: 428
4:3 449
4:4 427
4:15 320
4:16 426
4:25 385
5:1 .....453, 470
5:5 151
5:8 .....41, 386, 391
5:9, 10 .389, 453, 493
5:10 ...410, 453, 454
5:12ff ..132, 322, 329
5:18 450
6:1-4 ..428, 430, 455
.....461, 549
6:2 .....358, 415
.....417, 419
6:6 358
6:11 419
6:18 424
6:21 348
6:23 348
7: 318, 320
.....456, 498
7:7-10 318
7:9 334
7:10ff 428
7:25 334
8:1 ....142, 498, 550
8:1-4 550
8:2 522
8:6, 7 .....317, 348

8:7 358
8:9 ....263, 264, 392
.....472, 475
8:11 249
8:14 475
8:14-17 .....247, 248
8:15 455
8:17 .....430, 494
8:18-22 ....265, 345
8:19-23 .....530, 552
8:23 .....248, 249
.....455, 494
8:24 .....249, 470
8:26, *27* 482
8:27 .....235, 259
.....484, 489
8:28-30 ....358, 359
.....441, 477
8:29 .....464, 553
8:30 359
8:35-39 495
8:38 524
9:1ff 481
9:4 455
9:5 .....147, 263
9:15 361
10:1 481
10:4 453
10:10ff 250
10:12ff 465
10:13 422
11:28 454
12:1ff 258
12:4ff 234, 432
13:10 196
14:10 548
14:17 518

I Corinthians

1:2 467
1:13 61
1:14-17 428
1:18, 20 383
1:23, 24 ....358, 383
2:2 383
2:6 506
2:10ff 234
2:14 48
3:1ff 500
3:6 463
3:10 432
3:14, 15 499
3:16 234
3:21, *22* 524
12:3 .....144, 255
.....433, 463
12:4-6 236
12:5 143
12:11 .....235, 365
12:12ff 234, 432
12:13 252
12:14 258
12:28 260
13: 196
13:8-12 556
13:13 556
14:26-33 259
15: ...345, 539, 540
.....541, 550
15:2 498
15:3, 4..132, 383, 385
....388, 391, 525
15:5 136
15:10 503
15:12 138
15:20-28 .176, 248, 530
15:22 132
15:23 .....527, 530
15:24 522
15:25ff ..139, 529, 530
15:44 543
15:45, 49 143
15:50ff 528, 544
15:51 534
15:52 527

II Corinthians

1:1 467
1:21 254
1:22 494
3:17, 18 263
5:1ff 525, 541
5:5 494
5:16 139
5:17 .....142, 456
.....461, 463
5:19 ...150, 319, 401
.....449, 453
5:21 .....383, 384
.....388, 449
7:10 417
8:9 .....134, 384
10:5 475
13:14 .....263, 236

Galatians

2:16 428
2:20 .....250, 416
....432, 457, 464
.....475, 518
3: 322
3:10-12 389
3:13 ....41, 343, 380
....383, 389, 403
.....403, 406
3:26 .....422, 465
4:4 .....117, 132
4:5 455
5:1 424
5:19-21 317
5:24 .....416, 457
6:14 ...383, 416, 457
6:15 456

Ephesians

1:1 467
1:3-14 362
1:3, 17 263
1:4 ....359, 362, 464
1:6 359
1:7 .....383, 388
....406, 437, 446
1:11 362
1:13, 14 ....249, 362
..... 494
2:3 331
2:8 .....422, 490
2:10 456

2:11-22 151
2:15 456
3:17 432
3:17 518
2:20 432
3:16, 17 ....234, 264
..... 432
4:1-16 258
4:11 260
4:13 506
4:24 456
4:30 ...235, 248, 494
5:18-20 ....253, 258
..... 259
5:22ff 432

Philippians

1:1 467
1:6 491
1:21 .....432, 464
1:21 24 535
1:23 .....524, 525
.....551, 553
2:5-11 134
....147, 148, 162
....163, 237, 449
2:6 140
2:8 .....41, 162
2:9-11 .....144, 177
..... 519
2:10, 11 529
2:12, 13 475
3:12, 13 ....329, 507
3:15 506
4:6, 7 478
4:13 432

Colossians

1:2 467
1:13ff 206
1:14 .....437, 446
1:15 .....148, 193
1:16 ...272, 274, 313
..... 393
1:17 .....242, 278
1:20 149
1:27 464
2:9 152
2:20-23 .....132, 457
3:1 432
3:9 419
3:10 456

I Thessalonians

1:10 527
4:13 528
4:16 .....527, 540
4:13-18 541
5:23 .....301, 468

II Thessalonians

1:7 527
1:8 424
1:10 527
2:1ff 531, 535
2:1, 8 527
4:16 .....527, 540
5:8 490

I Timothy

1:15 323
1:13 330
1:15 329
1:15 375
2:3, 4 366
2:5 132
2:13, 14 315
3:15 234
3:15 .....234, 215

II Timothy

3:12 502
3:16, 17 109
4:1, 18 522
4:6ff 535
4:6, 8 524

Titus

1:2 496
2:13 147
3:7 490

Hebrews

1:3 ....139, 192, 278
1:5 380
2:10 168
2:14 132
2:14-16 525
2:17 390
3:5, 12, 21 488
3:6, 14 499
4:12 301
4:14 499
4:15 132
4:16 410
5:7 133
5:8 .....133, 168
5:12ff 499, 500
5:14 506
6:1 506
6:7, 8 499
6:18 496
7:25 .....410, 493
8:10 469
8:10-12 .....13, 48
8:11, 12 437
9:11-15 386
9:12 ...380, 407, 491
9:14 .....384, 390
9:15ff 383
9:24 410
9:26 380
10:1ff 384, 386
10:10 .....380, 383
10:12, 14 ....380, 383
.....407, 491
10:22 390
10:26ff 330, 499
10:29 325
11: 60
11:3 272
11:27 61
12:14 .....468, 506

James

1:13 496
1:6 488
2:14 431
2:24 430
4:7 502
5:8, 9 537

I Peter

1:1 .....360, 361
1:3 456

1:5 ....490, 491, 495
1:7 527
1:11, 20 140
1:16 209
1:19 ....41, 383, 391
1:23 ...250, 456, 464
2:19ff 395, 396
2:24, 25 383
3:18 .....384, 396
4:17 424
5:7 478

II Peter

1:4 461
1:8-11 499
1:16 527
1:21 109
2:20, 22 499
3:1ff 536
3:4, 8, 12 527
3:9 .....366, 529
3:12 530
3:13 345
3:13 552
3:18 500

I John

1:1, 2 .....42, 132
1:5 .....67, 194
1:8 .....329, 507
1:9 .....199, 217
1:12 465
2:1 410
2:2 .....384, 390
..... 407
2:7 234
2:15-17 502
2:19 499
2:22 325
2:27 472
2:28 527
2:29 507
2:34 472
3:2 .....464, 508
3:2 553
3:6-9 .....463, 472
.....492, 507
3:10ff 472
3:13 550
3:24 472
4:4 .....493, 502
4:7ff 204
4:8 .....67, 152, 204
4:16 152
4:19 364
5:4, 5 502
5:13-19 ....325, 470
5:14 489
5:16 499
5:19, 20 217

II John

v.9 499

Revelation

1:5 .....380, 446
.....439, 494
1:5 .....384, 388
1:9 518
1:10-20 177
1:12, 16, 20 529
1:16 529
2:7, 17, 26 490
2:7, 11, 17, 26 .. 498
2:11 .....350, 500
3:5, 12, 21 490
3:5, 12, 21 498
4: 272
5: 272
5:9 384
6:9 302
7:17 554
12:10 463
12:10 555
12:11 384
12:11 502
19:16 144
20: 553
20:1-10 533,539
20:6, 14 350
20: 10, 14, 15.... 557
20:11ff 540, 538
20:11-15 550
20:13 548
21: 553
21: 550
21:1 .....530, 548
21:4 554
21:8 .....350, 557
22:3 ....345, 554, 555
22:15 530